arXiv:0707.1708v1 [math.NT] 11 Jul 2007

ON CERTAIN PERIOD RELATIONS FOR CUSP FORMS ON GL_n

A. RAGHURAM AND FREYDOON SHAHIDI

Abstract. Let π be a regular algebraic cuspidal automorphic representation of $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{A}_F)$ for a number field F. We consider certain periods attached to π. These periods were originally defined by Harder when $n = 2$, and later by Mahnkopf when $F = \mathbb{Q}$. In the first part of the paper we analyze the behaviour of these periods upon twisting π by algebraic Hecke characters. In the latter part of the paper we consider Shimura's periods associated to a modular form. If φ_χ is the cusp form associated to a character χ of a quadratic extension, then we relate the periods of φ_{χ^n} to those of φ_χ, and as a consequence give another proof of Deligne's conjecture on the critical values of symmetric power L-functions associated to dihedral modular forms. Finally, we make some remarks on the symmetric fourth power L-functions.

Contents

1. Introduction 2
2. Periods of cusp forms 4
2.1. Notation and some preliminaries 4
2.2. Definition of the periods 5
2.3. Behaviour under twisting 11
2.4. Some remarks 19
3. Deligne's conjecture 20
3.1. Statement of the conjecture 20
3.2. Some known results on special values of L-functions 22
3.3. Some lemmas 24
3.4. Dihedral forms 28
4. Remarks on symmetric fourth power L-functions 34
4.1. Consequences of cuspidality of the symmetric fourth 34
4.2. Cohomological criterion 37
4.3. Special values 37
References 38

Date: February 1, 2008.
1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* (Primary)11F67. (Secondary)11F70, 22E55.

1. Introduction

The main goal of this paper is to analyze certain periods attached to cuspidal representations of GL_n. If π is such a representation, the periods we consider are nonzero complex numbers attached to π which are (expected to be) intimately linked to the special values of the standard L-function of π. In general, these are the only periods defined for representations of GL_n, and ultimately, a study of the special values of L-functions may be reduced, via functoriality, to a study of these periods.

Let F be a number field and let π be a cuspidal automorphic representation of $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{A}_F)$. We assume that π is regular and algebraic, which is a condition entirely on the infinity component π_∞ of π. This assumption makes π arithmetically interesting, for example, it ensures that the finite part π_f is defined over a number field $\mathbb{Q}(\pi_f)$. Let S_r be the set of real places of F. We let $\epsilon = (\epsilon_v)_{v \in S_r}$ be a signature indexed by the real places with $\epsilon_v \in \{\pm\}$. In the signature, ϵ_v can be any sign if n is even, and if n is odd, then ϵ is uniquely determined by π. To this data we attach a nonzero complex number $p^\epsilon(\pi_f)$ which we call a period of π. See Definition 2.2.5. These periods are defined by comparing a certain canonical $\mathbb{Q}(\pi_f)$-structure on the Whittaker model of π_f with a $\mathbb{Q}(\pi_f)$-structure on a suitable cohomology space to which π has nonzero contribution. The comparison map between these two spaces is essentially the inverse of the map giving the Fourier coefficients of cusp forms in the space of π. These periods were first defined by Harder [12] for representations of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{A}_F)$, and later were generalized by Mahnkopf [24] in the case of $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{A}_\mathbb{Q})$. In both these works they are defined to analyze the special values of the standard L-function $L(s, \pi_f)$ attached to π_f.

Concerning special values of L-functions, often times, it is interesting to know how these values change under functorial operations on the representation at hand. For example, one can ask for the behaviour of $L(m, \pi_f \otimes \xi_f)$ as a function of the Hecke character ξ_f. One application of such a question is the subject of p-adic L-functions. This translates to a question about the behaviour of the periods attached to π_f upon twisting π_f by Hecke characters. One of the main aims of this paper is to answer this question for the periods $p^\epsilon(\pi_f)$. In §2.3 we prove the following

Theorem 2.3.1. *Let π be a regular algebraic cuspidal automorphic representation of $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{A}_F)$, and let ξ be an algebraic Hecke character of F. We attach a signature ϵ_ξ to ξ. We let $\gamma(\xi_f)$ be the Gauss sum attached to ξ. Then*

$$p^{\epsilon \cdot \epsilon_\xi}(\pi_f) \sim_{\mathbb{Q}(\pi_f, \xi_f)} \gamma(\xi_f)^{-n(n-1)/2} p^\epsilon(\pi_f)$$

for any permissible signature ϵ for π (which is an issue only when n is odd). By $\sim_{\mathbb{Q}(\pi_f, \xi_f)}$ we mean up to an element of the number field $\mathbb{Q}(\pi_f, \xi_f)$. Moreover, the quotient $p^{\epsilon \cdot \epsilon_\xi}(\pi_f)/(\gamma(\xi_f)^{-n(n-1)/2} p^\epsilon(\pi_f))$ is equivariant under the action of the automorphism group of complex numbers.

The proof of this theorem is a little involved to explain in the introduction, however we ask the reader to look at the diagram of maps (2.3.2). The proof comes out of an analysis of that diagram; the period relation somehow captures the obstruction to commutativity of this diagram.

One special case of this theorem is when F is a real quadratic field, and π corresponds to a Hilbert modular form of CM type, then our period relations are formally the same period relations proved by Murty and Ramakrishnan in [26]. The reader should also compare our Theorem 2.3.1 with the conjectures of Blasius and Panchiskin on the behaviour of Deligne's periods attached to a motive upon twisting it by Artin motives. See §2.4.

A second aim of this paper is to consider Deligne's conjectures about the special values of the symmetric power L-functions attached to a holomorphic modular form. In §3.1 we recall the precise statement of the conjecture. See Conjecture 3.1.1. (See also our previous paper [29] concerning the implications of some recent progress in Langlands functoriality for the special values of symmetric power L-functions.) If the modular cusp form is of CM type, namely, if the associated cuspidal representation is induced from a character χ of an imaginary quadratic extension, then we say the modular form is of dihedral type, and denote it by φ_χ. Now Deligne's conjecture on special values of the symmetric power L-functions attached to dihedral forms is known via motivic techniques; this is because Deligne's main conjecture [8, Conjecture 2.8] is known if one considers only the motives as those attached to abelian varieties and the category used is that defined by using absolute Hodge cycles for morphisms. In §3.4 we give an elementary proof in the dihedral case using only L-function techniques. In Theorem 3.4.7, we prove another period relation, which after some formal functorial calculations, implies Deligne's conjecture. We now proceed to describe these period relations.

Given a holomorphic modular cusp form φ on the upper half plane, let $u^{\pm}(\varphi)$ be the periods attached to φ by Shimura [35]. The critical values of $L(s, \varphi)$ are described in terms of $u^{\pm}(\varphi)$ [35, Theorem 1]. Now, if $\varphi = \varphi_\chi$ is dihedral, then one can check that the r-th symmetric power L-function attached to φ_χ is essentially a product of L-functions of φ_{χ^n} for various powers of χ. See Corollary 3.4.3 for the precise factorization. One can deduce Deligne's conjecture if one relates the periods of φ_{χ^n} to the periods of φ_χ. This is the content of our second main theorem of this paper. In §3.4 we prove the following

Theorem 3.4.7. *Let χ be a Hecke character of K, where K is an imaginary quadratic extension of $\mathbb{Q}$. Assume that $\chi_\infty(z) = (z/|z|)^{k-1}$ for an integer $k \geq 2$. Let φ_χ be the corresponding primitive modular cusp form. Then we have*

$$u^{+}(\varphi_{\chi^n}) \sim_{\mathbb{Q}(\chi)} u^{+}(\varphi_\chi)^n, \text{ and } \ u^{-}(\varphi_{\chi^n}) \sim_{\mathbb{Q}(\chi)} u^{+}(\varphi_\chi)^n \gamma(\omega_K)$$

where $\gamma(\omega_K)$ is the Gauss sum of the quadratic Hecke character ω_K of $\mathbb{Q}$ attached to K by class field theory; and $\sim_{\mathbb{Q}(\chi)}$ means up to an element of $\mathbb{Q}(\chi)$.

Again, we prove a stronger $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{C})$-equivariant version of this period relation. The proof of this theorem is by induction on n, while using the Rankin-Selberg L-function attached to $\varphi_{\chi^n} \times \varphi_\chi$; the proof also uses some well known nonvanishing results for twists of L-functions (see Lemma 3.4.8).

In §4 we take up the theme of our paper [29], of using Langlands functoriality to special values of L-functions, as applied to the case of the symmetric fourth lifting of a holomorphic modular form. We know from the work of Kim [14] that given a cuspidal representation π of GL_2, $\mathrm{Sym}^4(\pi)$ exists as an automorphic representation of GL_5. The hope is to be able to use this, in conjunction with the recent work of Mahnkopf [24] on the special values of standard L-functions on GL_n over $\mathbb{Q}$, to prove Deligne's conjecture on the special values of symmetric fourth power L-function attached to a modular form. Pursuing this line of thought, in §4.3, we have recorded the current status of what is known, and what are some of the impediments; which in turn may be construed as an impetus for future work.

It might help the reader to know that §2 and §3 are quite independent of each other. However, the relatively short §4 depends on both §2 and §3.

Acknowledgements: We are grateful to Laurent Clozel, Paul Garrett, Joachim Mahnkopf, Dipendra Prasad, Dinakar Ramakrishnan and David Vogan for helpful correspondence. The first author thanks the warm hospitality of Purdue University. Both authors would like to thank Steve Kudla, Michael Rapoport and Joachim Schwermer for the invitation to spend some time in the stimulating atmosphere of the Erwin Schrödinger Institute in Vienna, where the work took its final form. This work is partially supported by the Vaughn foundation for (A.R.), and by NSF grants DMS-0200325 and DMS-0700280 for (F.S.).

2. Periods of cusp forms

2.1. **Notation and some preliminaries.**

For a number field F, we let $\mathbb{A}_F$ stand for its adèle ring, and $\mathbb{I}_F = \mathbb{A}_F^\times$ be its group of idèles. We let $\| \ \|_F : \mathbb{I}_F \to \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ be the adèlic norm defined by $\|x\|_F = \prod_v |x_v|_v$, with v running over all places of F, and the local absolute values all being the normalized ones. When there is no confusion about the base field F, we will drop the subscript F from $\mathbb{A}_F$, $\mathbb{I}_F$, and $\| \ \|_F$. For any finite set S of places of F we use a superscript S to denote a product outside S, and a subscript S to denote a product within S. For example, if S_∞ stands for the set of all infinite places of F, then the ring of finite adèles is $\mathbb{A}_F^{S_\infty}$ and will be denoted $\mathbb{A}_{F,f}$ or simply as $\mathbb{A}_f$. We let S_r stand for the set of real places and so $S_c := S_\infty - S_r$ is the set of complex places. Let r_1 (respectively r_2) denote the number of real (respectively complex) places of F; the degree of F is $d_F := [F : \mathbb{Q}] = r_1 + 2r_2$.

Let $G = \mathrm{GL}_n$, and let $Z = Z_n$ be the center of G, both regarded as F-groups. Let $G_\infty = G(F \otimes \mathbb{R}) = G(\mathbb{R})^{r_1} \times G(\mathbb{C})^{r_2}$. Following Borel–Jacquet [5, §4.6], we say an irreducible representation of $G(\mathbb{A})$ is automorphic if it is isomorphic to an irreducible subquotient of the representation of $G(\mathbb{A})$ on its space of automorphic forms. We say an automorphic representation is cuspidal if it is a subrepresentation of the representation of $G(\mathbb{A})$ on the space of cusp forms $\mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{cusp}}(G(F)\backslash G(\mathbb{A}))$. For an automorphic representation π of $G(\mathbb{A})$, we have $\pi = \pi_\infty \otimes \pi_f$, where $\pi_\infty = \otimes_{v \in S_\infty} \pi_v$ is a representation of G_∞, and $\pi_f = \otimes_{v \notin S_\infty} \pi_v$ is a representation of $G(\mathbb{A}_f)$.

By a Hecke character ξ of F, we mean a continuous unitary character of $F^* \backslash \mathbb{I}_F$. We follow the terminology as in Neukirch's book [27, §VII.6]. Such a character admits a module of definition, say $\mathfrak{m}$, which is an integral ideal of F. If ξ is a Hecke character modulo $\mathfrak{m}$, then we will also identify ξ with the corresponding Größencharakter modulo $\mathfrak{m}$ as in [27, VII.6.14].

2.2. **Definition of the periods.** Let F be a number field. The purpose of this section is to define certain periods attached to a regular algebraic cuspidal automorphic representation π of $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{A}_F)$. This definition is due to Harder [12] for GL_2, and is due to Mahnkopf [24] in the case $F = \mathbb{Q}$. (We refer the reader to Clozel [7] for the definitions of a cuspidal representation being regular and algebraic.)

Before we get into the details of the definition, we very roughly indicate the ingredients needed in making the definition. We will have a number field E. We will have two $\mathbb{C}$-vector spaces V_1 and V_2 with E-structures V_1^0 and V_2^0 respectively. (By V_i^0 being an E-structure for V_i, we mean an E-subspace such that the canonical map $V_i^0 \otimes_E \mathbb{C} \to V_i$ is an isomorphism.) In our situation, the spaces V_i will be representation spaces, and not merely vector spaces, and the E-structures will be unique up to homotheties. Finally, we will have a comparison isomorphism $\phi : V_1 \to V_2$. The period attached to ϕ, denoted $p(\phi)$, is a nonzero complex number such that $\phi(V_1^0) = p(\phi) V_2^0$. Observe that $p(\phi)$ is a well defined element in $\mathbb{C}^*/E^*$. For us, the number field E will be the rationality field of π, the space V_1 will be the Whittaker model of π, and the space V_2 will be a certain cohomology space (to which π will have nonzero contribution), and the comparison isomorphism ϕ will be related to taking the Fourier coefficient of a cusp form in the space of π. We now proceed to make all this precise.

The first ingredient we need is the *rationality field* of π, or really, π_f. The definitive reference is Clozel [7, Chapter 3]. Given π, suppose V is the representation space of π_f, any $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{C})$ defines a representation π_f^σ on $V \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbb{C}_{\sigma^{-1}}$ where $G(\mathbb{A}_f)$ acts on the first factor. Let $\mathcal{S}(\pi_f)$ be the subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{C})$ consisting of all σ such that $\pi_f^\sigma \simeq \pi_f$. Define the rationality field $\mathbb{Q}(\pi_f)$ of π_f as the subfield of $\mathbb{C}$ fixed by $\mathcal{S}(\pi_f)$; we denote this as $\mathbb{Q}(\pi_f) = \mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{S}(\pi_f)}$. For example, if χ is a Dirichlet character, also thought of as an idèle class character, then $\mathbb{Q}(\chi_f)$ is the field $\mathbb{Q}(\{\text{Values of } \chi\})$. Similarly, if φ is a primitive holomorphic cusp form on the upper half plane, of even weight $2k$, for the Hecke congruence subgroup $\Gamma_0(N)$, with Fourier expansion $\varphi(z) = \sum_{n=1}^\infty a_n q^n$, and if $\pi = \pi(\varphi)$ is the cuspidal automorphic representation associated to φ, then $\mathbb{Q}(\pi_f) = \mathbb{Q}(\{a_n : n \geq 1\})$–the field generated by all the Fourier coefficients of φ. (See [39].) In this example, the weight is assumed to be even to ensure that π is algebraic. If the weight is odd, the same is true with π replaced by $\pi \otimes \| \ \|^{-1/2}$. The main results that we need about the rationality field is stated in the following theorem. (See [7, Théorème 3.13] and [39, Chapter I].)

Theorem 2.2.1 (Eichler, Shimura, Harder, Waldspurger, Clozel)**.** *Let* π *be a regular algebraic cuspidal automorphic representation of* $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{A}_F)$*. Then,*

1. $\mathbb{Q}(\pi_f)$ *is a number field.*
2. π_f *admits a* $\mathbb{Q}(\pi_f)$*-structure, which is unique up to homotheties.*
3. *For any* $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{C})$*,* π_f^σ *is the finite part of a cuspidal automorphic representation (which we denote by* π^σ*).*

The next ingredient we need is *the Whittaker model of* π_f *and a semilinear action of* $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{C})$ *on this space*, which will commute with the action of $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{A}_f)$. Toward this, we fix a nontrivial character ψ of $F\backslash\mathbb{A}_F$. (For convenience we fix ψ as in Tate's thesis, namely, $\psi(x) = e^{2\pi i\Lambda(x)}$ with the Λ as defined in [38, §4.1].) We can write $\psi = \psi_\infty \otimes \psi_f$ (the meaning and notation being the obvious one). We let $W(\pi,\psi)$ be the Whittaker model of π, and this factors as $W(\pi,\psi) = W(\pi_\infty,\psi_\infty) \otimes W(\pi_f,\psi_f)$. There is a semilinear action of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{C})$ on $W(\pi_f,\psi_f)$ which is defined as follows. (See [12, pp. 79-80] or [24, pp. 594].) That the values of ψ are all roots of unity suggests that we consider the cyclotomic character

$$\begin{array}{lclclclcl}
\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{C}/\mathbb{Q}) & \to & \mathrm{Gal}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}/\mathbb{Q}) & \to & \mathrm{Gal}(\mathbb{Q}(\mu_\infty)/\mathbb{Q}) & \to & \widehat{\mathbb{Z}}^\times \simeq \prod_p \mathbb{Z}_p^\times & \subset & \prod_p \prod_{\mathfrak{p}|p} \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{p}}^\times \\
\sigma & \mapsto & \sigma|_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}} & \mapsto & \sigma|_{\mathbb{Q}(\mu_\infty)} & \mapsto & t_\sigma & \mapsto & t_\sigma
\end{array}$$

where the last inclusion is the one induced by the diagonal embedding of $\mathbb{Z}_p^\times$ into $\prod_{\mathfrak{p}|p} \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{p}}^\times$. (Here $\mathfrak{p}$ is a prime of F above p, and $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is the ring of integers of the completion $F_{\mathfrak{p}}$ of F at $\mathfrak{p}$.) The element t_σ at the end can be thought of as an element of $\mathbb{A}_f^\times = \mathbb{I}_f$. Let $t_{\sigma,n}$ denote the diagonal matrix $\mathrm{diag}(t_\sigma^{-(n-1)}, t_\sigma^{-(n-2)}, \dots, 1)$ regarded as an element of $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{A}_f)$. For $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{C})$ and $\phi \in W(\pi_f,\psi_f)$, define the function $W_\sigma(\phi)$ by

$$W_\sigma(\phi)(g_f) = \sigma(\phi(t_{\sigma,n} g_f))$$

for all $g_f \in \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{A}_f)$. It is easily seen that W_σ is a σ-linear $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{A}_f)$-equivariant isomorphism from $W(\pi_f,\psi_f)$ onto $W(\pi_f^\sigma,\psi_f)$. For any finite extension $E/\mathbb{Q}(\pi_f)$ we have an E-structure on $W(\pi_f,\psi_f)$ by taking invariants:

$$W(\pi_f,\psi_f)_E = W(\pi_f,\psi_f)^{\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{C}/E)}.$$

As a matter of notation, given a $\mathbb{C}$-vector space V, and given a subfield $E \subset \mathbb{C}$, we will let V_E stand for an E-structure on V (if there is one at hand). Fixing an E-structure gives an action of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{C}/E)$ on V, by making it act on the second factor in $V = V_E \otimes_E \mathbb{C}$. Having fixed an E-structure, for any extension E'/E, we have a canonical E'-structure by letting $V_{E'} = V_E \otimes_E E'$. Further, as a notational convenience, when we talk of Whittaker models, we will henceforth suppress the additive character ψ, since that has been fixed once and for all; for example, $W(\pi_f)$ will denote $W(\pi_f,\psi_f)$. Also, we will denote the map W_σ simply by σ.

As mentioned earlier, the periods come via a comparison of $W(\pi_f)_E$ with a rational structure on a suitable cohomology space. We now describe this cohomology space. Recall that $G = G_n = \mathrm{GL}_n$ and the center of G is denoted Z_n or Z. Let $\mathfrak{g}_\infty$ be the Lie algebra of G_∞. Let $K_\infty = \otimes_{v\in S_\infty} K_v$ where $K_v = Z_n(\mathbb{R})O_n(\mathbb{R})$ if v is real, and $K_v = Z_n(\mathbb{C})U_n(\mathbb{C})$ if v is complex. Let $K^0 = K^0_\infty$ be the topological connected component of K_∞. Note that $K_\infty/K^0_\infty \simeq (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^{r_1}$. Let $b^{\mathbb{R}}_n$ be $n^2/4$ if n is even, and $(n^2-1)/4$ if n is odd. We also let $b^{\mathbb{C}}_n$ be $n(n-1)/2$. Now we define $b = r_1 b^{\mathbb{R}}_n + r_2 b^{\mathbb{C}}_n$. The integer b depends only on the base field F and the rank n of GL_n. It is the *bottom degree* of the so called *cuspidal range* for GL_n as an F-group. The next ingredient we need in defining the period is *relative Lie algebra cohomology of* π *in degree* b. For a $(\mathfrak{g}_\infty, K^0_\infty)$-module U, we let $H^*(\mathfrak{g}_\infty, K^0_\infty; U)$ stand for relative Lie algebra cohomology of U, for the definition and properties of which we refer the reader to Borel and Wallach's book [6]. Given a representation τ of G_∞, by $H^*(\mathfrak{g}_\infty, K^0_\infty; \tau)$, we will mean the cohomology of the $(\mathfrak{g}_\infty, K^0_\infty)$-module consisting of smooth K_∞-finite vectors of τ.

Let $T = T_n$ denote the maximal torus of GL_n consisting of diagonal matrices. We regard T as an F-group, and let $T_\infty = T(F\otimes\mathbb{R}) = T(\mathbb{R})^{r_1}\times T(\mathbb{C})^{r_2}$. We let $B = B_n$ stand for the Borel subgroup of G of upper triangular matrices. This defines B_∞. We let $X(T_\infty)$ stand for the group of all algebraic characters of T_∞. We let $X^+(T_\infty)$ stand for the subset of $X(T_\infty)$ consisting of all those characters which are dominant with respect to B_∞. A weight $\mu \in X^+(T_\infty)$ may be described as follows: Let $\mu = (\mu_v)_{v\in S_\infty}$, with $\mu_v \in X(T_v)$. If $v \in S_r$, then $\mu_v = (p_1,\dots,p_n)$, $p_i\in\mathbb{Z}$, $p_1 \ge p_2 \ge \cdots \ge p_n$, and the character is: if $t = \mathrm{diag}(t_1,\dots,t_n)\in T(F_v) = T(\mathbb{R})$, then $t\mapsto \prod_i t_i^{p_i}$. If $v\in S_c$, then let $\{\iota_v, \bar\iota_v\}$ be the corresponding complex embeddings of F. Identify F_v with $\mathbb{C}$ via ι_v (say). In this case, μ_v is a pair of sequences $(\mu_{\iota_v}, \mu_{\bar\iota_v})$, with $\mu_{\iota_v} = (p_1,\dots,p_n)$, $p_i\in\mathbb{Z}$, $p_1\ge p_2\ge\cdots\ge p_n$; likewise $\mu_{\bar\iota_v} = (q_1,\dots,q_n)$ with similar conditions on the q_i's; the character μ_v is: if $t = \mathrm{diag}(z_1,\dots,z_n)\in T(F_v) = T(\mathbb{C})$, then $t\mapsto\prod_i z_i^{p_i}\bar z_i^{q_i}$. (Here $\bar z_i$ is the complex conjugate of z_i.) For such a character μ, we define a finite dimensional representation (ρ_μ, M_μ) of G_∞ as follows. For $v\in S_r$, let $(\rho_{\mu_v}, M_{\mu_v})$ be the irreducible representation of $G(F_v) = G(\mathbb{R})$ with highest weight μ_v. For $v\in S_c$, let $(\rho_{\mu_v}, M_{\mu_v})$ be the representation of $G(F_v) = G(\mathbb{C})$ defined as $\rho_{\mu_v} = \rho_{\mu_{\iota_v}}\otimes\rho_{\mu_{\bar\iota_v}}$, where $\rho_{\mu_{\iota_v}}$ is the irreducible representation with highest weight μ_{ι_v}, and similarly $\rho_{\mu_{\bar\iota_v}}$. Now we let $\rho_\mu = \otimes_{v\in S_\infty}\rho_{\mu_v}$. Since π is a regular algebraic cuspidal automorphic representation of $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{A})$, we have from the proof of [7, Théorème 3.13] that there is a dominant algebraic weight $\mu\in X^+(T_\infty)$ such that $H^*(\mathfrak{g}_\infty, K^0_\infty; \pi_\infty\otimes\rho^\vee_\mu)\ne 0$. In defining the periods, we will be looking at $H^b(\mathfrak{g}_\infty, K^0_\infty; \pi_\infty\otimes\rho^\vee_\mu)$.

The group $K_\infty/K^0_\infty \simeq (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^{r_1}$ acts on $H^b(\mathfrak{g}_\infty, K^0_\infty; \pi_\infty\otimes M^\vee_\mu)$. We consider certain isotypic components for this action. Consider an r_1 tuple of signs indexed by the set S_r of real places in S_∞. Let $\epsilon = (\epsilon_v)_{v\in S_r}\in\{1\!\!1, \mathrm{sgn}\}^{r_1} = (K_\infty/K^0_\infty)\widehat{}$. If n is even then there are no restrictions on ϵ, however, if n is odd then π uniquely determines an ϵ, in that we let $\epsilon_v = \omega_{\pi_v}|_{\pm1}\cdot\mathrm{sgn}^{\mathrm{wt}(\mu_v)/2}$, where the weight $\mathrm{wt}(\mu_v)$ of μ_v is defined in [24, (3.1)]. (If n is odd, then for $v\in S_r$, ϵ_v is simply the central character of $\pi_v\otimes\rho^\vee_{\mu_v}$

restricted to $\{\pm 1\}$, since the parity of n means that $K_v/K_v^0 \simeq \{\pm 1\} \subset Z_n(F_v)$.) Let $H^b(\mathfrak{g}_\infty, K_\infty^0; \pi_\infty \otimes M_\mu^\vee)(\epsilon)$ be the corresponding isotypic component. This isotypic component is one dimensional. This can be seen, by using [24, (3.2)] for the real places, [7, Lemme 3.14] for the (real and) complex places, and the Künneth theorem for Lie algebra cohomology [6, I.1.3], as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& H^b(\mathfrak{g}_\infty, K_\infty^0; \pi_\infty \otimes M_\mu^\vee)(\epsilon) \\
= & \bigoplus_{\sum a_v = b} \left(\bigotimes_{v \in S_r} H^{a_v}(\mathfrak{g}_v, K_v^0; \pi_v \otimes M_{\mu_v}^\vee)(\epsilon_v) \bigotimes_{v \in S_c} H^{a_v}(\mathfrak{g}_v, K_v^0; \pi_v \otimes M_{\mu_v}^\vee) \right) \\
= & \bigotimes_{v \in S_r} H^{b_n^{\mathbb{R}}}(\mathfrak{g}_v, K_v^0; \pi_v \otimes M_{\mu_v}^\vee)(\epsilon_v) \bigotimes_{v \in S_c} H^{b_n^{\mathbb{C}}}(\mathfrak{g}_v, K_v^0; \pi_v \otimes M_{\mu_v}^\vee).
\end{aligned}$$

In the summation, only one term survives, because for all other summands, at least one of the a_v has to be less than $b_n^{\mathbb{R}}$ or $b_n^{\mathbb{C}}$, and by [7, Lemme 3.14] the corresponding factor vanishes. We fix a generator $\mathbf{w}_\infty = \mathbf{w}(\pi_\infty, \epsilon)$ for this one dimensional space $H^b(\mathfrak{g}_\infty, K_\infty^0; \pi_\infty \otimes M_\mu^\vee)(\epsilon)$.

We have the following comparison isomorphism of the Whittaker model $W(\pi_f)$ with a global version of the above cohomology space. We let $\mathcal{F}_{\pi_f,\epsilon,\mathbf{w}_\infty}$ denote the compositum of the three isomorphisms:

$$\begin{aligned}
W(\pi_f) & \longrightarrow W(\pi_f) \otimes H^b(\mathfrak{g}_\infty, K_\infty^0; W(\pi_\infty) \otimes M_\mu^\vee)(\epsilon) \\
& \longrightarrow H^b(\mathfrak{g}_\infty, K_\infty^0; W(\pi) \otimes M_\mu^\vee)(\epsilon) \\
& \longrightarrow H^b(\mathfrak{g}_\infty, K_\infty^0; V_\pi \otimes M_\mu^\vee)(\epsilon),
\end{aligned}$$

where the first map is $w_f \mapsto w_f \otimes \mathbf{w}_\infty$; the second map is the obvious one; and the third map is the map induced in cohomology by the inverse of the map which gives the Fourier coefficient of a cusp form in V_π–the space of functions in $\mathcal{A}_{\rm cusp}(G(F)\backslash G(\mathbb{A}))$ which realizes π.

We now describe a rational structure on $H^b(\mathfrak{g}_\infty, K_\infty^0; V_\pi \otimes M_\mu^\vee)(\epsilon)$, by relating relative Lie algebra cohomology with the cohomology of locally symmetric spaces. (See [7, pp.128–129], [24, §3.2].) Let K_f be any open compact subgroup of $G(\mathbb{A}_f)$. Consider the manifold

$$S(K_f) = G(F)\backslash G(\mathbb{A})/K_\infty^0 K_f.$$

This is typically a finite disjoint union of manifolds like $\Gamma\backslash G_\infty/K_\infty^0$. For a dominant algebraic weight $\mu \in X^+(T_\infty)$ the corresponding finite dimensional representation (ρ_μ, M_μ) of G_∞ is defined over $\mathbb{Q}$. Fix a $\mathbb{Q}$-structure $M_{\mu,\mathbb{Q}}$ on M_μ which gives a canonical E-structure for any extension $E/\mathbb{Q}$ by $M_{\mu,E} = M_{\mu,\mathbb{Q}} \otimes E$. Let $\mathcal{M}_{\mu,E}$ be the associated locally constant sheaf on $S(K_f)$. For brevity, we also let $M_\mu = M_{\mu,\mathbb{C}}$ and similarly $\mathcal{M}_\mu = \mathcal{M}_{\mu,\mathbb{C}}$. We consider the direct limit of various cohomology groups

$$H_?^\bullet(\tilde{S}, \mathcal{M}_\mu^\vee) = \varinjlim H_?^\bullet(S(K_f), \mathcal{M}_\mu^\vee),$$

where the direct limit is taken over all open compact subgroups K_f of $G(\mathbb{A}_f)$, and $? \in \{B, dR, c, \mathrm{cusp}\}$ meaning singular (Betti) cohomology, or de Rham cohomology, or cohomology with compact supports, or cuspidal cohomology, respectively. Cuspidal cohomology injects into cohomology with compact supports $H^\bullet_{\mathrm{cusp}}(\tilde{S}, \mathcal{M}^\vee_\mu) \hookrightarrow H^\bullet_c(\tilde{S}, \mathcal{M}^\vee_\mu)$ and the latter is canonically a module for $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{C}) \times G(\mathbb{A}_f)$ with commuting actions for the different groups. The image of cuspidal cohomology is defined over $\mathbb{Q}$. Also, cuspidal cohomology decomposes into a direct sum over cuspidal cohomological representations and a rational structure on any summand is obtained by intersecting that summand with a rational structure of the ambient space. (As a general reference for all of this, see Clozel [7, §3.5].)

More precisely, by definition of cuspidal cohomology, we have

$$H^b_{\mathrm{cusp}}(\tilde{S}, \mathcal{M}^\vee_\mu) \simeq H^b(\mathfrak{g}_\infty, K^0_\infty; \mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{cusp}}(G(F)\backslash G(\mathbb{A})) \otimes M^\vee_\mu). \tag{2.2.2}$$

From the decomposition of $\mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{cusp}}(G(F)\backslash G(\mathbb{A}))$ into cuspidal automorphic representations, we deduce that the right hand side decomposes into a direct sum

$$H^b(\mathfrak{g}_\infty, K^0_\infty; \mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{cusp}}(G(F)\backslash G(\mathbb{A})) \otimes M^\vee_\mu) \simeq \bigoplus_{\pi \in \mathrm{Coh}(G,\mu^\vee)} H^b(\mathfrak{g}_\infty, K^0_\infty; V_\pi \otimes M^\vee_\mu).$$

This also defines the notation $\mathrm{Coh}(G, \mu^\vee)$ as the set consisting of all π having a nonzero contribution in the right hand side. Now consider the action of K_∞/K^0_∞, and further decompose each summand into its isotypic components. Let $\epsilon \in (K_\infty/K^0_\infty)\widehat{}$ be as before, i.e., if n is even then ϵ can be any character, and if n is odd, then ϵ is uniquely determined by π. We let $\tilde{\pi} = \pi_f \otimes \epsilon$, and denote the inverse image of $H^b(\mathfrak{g}_\infty, K^0_\infty; V_\pi \otimes M^\vee_\mu)(\epsilon)$ across the isomorphism in (2.2.2) by $H^b_{\mathrm{cusp}}(\tilde{S}, \mathcal{M}^\vee_\mu)(\tilde{\pi})$. We have

$$H^b_{\mathrm{cusp}}(\tilde{S}, \mathcal{M}^\vee_\mu) \simeq \bigoplus_{\pi \in \mathrm{Coh}(G,\mu^\vee)} \bigoplus_{\epsilon} H^b_{\mathrm{cusp}}(\tilde{S}, \mathcal{M}^\vee_\mu)(\tilde{\pi}),$$

where in the second summation ϵ is as described above. (See also [24, (3.13)].)

We now have the following description of the rational structures. The Betti cohomology spaces $H^b_B(\tilde{S}, \mathcal{M}^\vee_\mu)$ are naturally defined over $\mathbb{Q}$, since the coefficient system admits a $\mathbb{Q}$-structure [7, p.122]. (This will be exploited in the proof of Proposition 2.3.6.) The $\mathbb{Q}$-structure on Betti cohomology induces a $\mathbb{Q}$-structure on cohomology with compact support [7, exact triangle on p.123] which we denote by $H^b_c(\tilde{S}, \mathcal{M}^\vee_\mu)_{\mathbb{Q}}$. This in turn induces a $\mathbb{Q}$-structure on the full space of cuspidal cohomology ([7, Théorèm 3.19])

$$H^b_{\mathrm{cusp}}(\tilde{S}, \mathcal{M}^\vee_\mu)_{\mathbb{Q}} = H^b_{\mathrm{cusp}}(\tilde{S}, \mathcal{M}^\vee_\mu) \cap H^b_c(\tilde{S}, \mathcal{M}^\vee_\mu)_{\mathbb{Q}}. \tag{2.2.3}$$

We get for each summand of cuspidal cohomology [7, Lemme 3.2.1]

$$H^b_{\mathrm{cusp}}(\tilde{S}, \mathcal{M}^\vee_\mu)(\tilde{\pi})_E = H^b_{\mathrm{cusp}}(\tilde{S}, \mathcal{M}^\vee_\mu)(\tilde{\pi}) \cap H^b_{\mathrm{cusp}}(\tilde{S}, \mathcal{M}^\vee_\mu)_E \tag{2.2.4}$$

for any extension $E/\mathbb{Q}(\pi_f)$. We can transport the rational structures (2.2.3) and (2.2.4) across the identifications with relative Lie algebra cohomology to get rational structures on the latter spaces as:

$$H^b(\mathfrak{g}_\infty, K_\infty^0; \mathcal{A}_{\rm cusp}(G(F)\backslash G(\mathbb{A})) \otimes M_\mu^\vee)_{\mathbb{Q}} :\simeq H^b_{\rm cusp}(\tilde{S}, \mathcal{M}_\mu^\vee)_{\mathbb{Q}},$$

and for any extension $E/\mathbb{Q}(\pi_f)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} H^b(\mathfrak{g}_\infty, K_\infty^0; V_\pi \otimes M_\mu^\vee)(\epsilon)_E \;\; = \;\; & H^b(\mathfrak{g}_\infty, K_\infty^0; V_\pi \otimes M_\mu^\vee)(\epsilon) \cap \\ & H^b(\mathfrak{g}_\infty, K_\infty^0; \mathcal{A}_{\rm cusp}(G(F)\backslash G(\mathbb{A})) \otimes M_\mu^\vee)_E. \end{aligned}$$

We recall that ${\rm Aut}(\mathbb{C})$ acts on objects indexed by S_∞ by acting on the embeddings of F into $\mathbb{C}$. For the precise definition of the action of ${\rm Aut}(\mathbb{C})$ on π_∞ see [7, §3.3]; this then defines an action of ${\rm Aut}(\mathbb{C})$ on μ and ϵ (they are determined by π), and finally, for $\sigma \in {\rm Aut}(\mathbb{C})$ we define $\mathbf{w}_\infty^\sigma$ as $\mathbf{w}(\pi_\infty, \epsilon)^\sigma := \mathbf{w}(\pi_\infty^\sigma, \epsilon^\sigma)$. We are now in a position to define the periods attached to π.

Definition 2.2.5. *Let π be a regular algebraic cuspidal automorphic representation of ${\rm GL}_n(\mathbb{A}_F)$. Let $\mu \in X^+(T_\infty)$ be such that $\pi \in {\rm Coh}(G, \mu^\vee)$. Let ϵ be a character of K_∞/K_∞^0. (If n is even then ϵ is any character, and if n is odd, then π uniquely determines ϵ.) Let $\mathbf{w}_\infty$ be a generator of the one dimensional vector space $H^b(\mathfrak{g}_\infty, K_\infty^0, \pi_\infty \otimes M_\mu^\vee)(\epsilon)$. To this data $(\pi, \epsilon, \mathbf{w}_\infty)$ is attached a period, that we denote $p^\epsilon(\pi_f, \mathbf{w}_\infty)$, which is a nonzero complex number such that the normalized map*

$$\mathcal{F}^0_{\pi_f,\epsilon,\mathbf{w}_\infty} := p^\epsilon(\pi_f, \mathbf{w}_\infty)^{-1} \mathcal{F}_{\pi_f,\epsilon,\mathbf{w}_\infty}$$

is ${\rm Aut}(\mathbb{C})$*-equivariant:*

$$\begin{tikzcd} W(\pi_f) \arrow[r, "\mathcal{F}^0_{\pi_f,\epsilon,\mathbf{w}_\infty}"] \arrow[d, "\sigma"'] & H^b(\mathfrak{g}_\infty, K_\infty^0; V_\pi \otimes M_\mu^\vee)(\epsilon) \arrow[d, "\sigma"] \\ W(\pi_f^\sigma) \arrow[r, "\mathcal{F}^0_{\pi_f^\sigma,\epsilon^\sigma,\mathbf{w}_\infty^\sigma}"] & H^b(\mathfrak{g}_\infty, K_\infty^0; V_{\pi^\sigma} \otimes M_{\mu^\sigma}^\vee)(\epsilon^\sigma) \end{tikzcd}$$

The period $p^\epsilon(\pi_f, \mathbf{w}_\infty)$ is well defined only up to multiplication by elements of $\mathbb{Q}(\pi_f)^*$.

It is helpful to simplify our notation a bit. We begin by fixing generators for all the possible one dimensional relative Lie algebra cohomology spaces for the groups ${\rm GL}_n(\mathbb{R})$ and ${\rm GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$. Having done so, we have therefore fixed generators for the cohomology spaces for the group G_∞. We also ask that this choice be compatible with twisting π_∞ by algebraic unitary characters ξ_∞ of G_∞; this condition although crucial in the proof of Proposition 2.3.7, is not a serious constraint. (For example, for $G = {\rm GL}_2$, the choice of a generator for H^1 as in Waldspurger [39, p.130-131] is already invariant under twisting.) This choice is compatible with the action of ${\rm Aut}(\mathbb{C})$ on automorphic representations at infinity. Henceforth, we abbreviate $\mathcal{F}_{\pi_f,\epsilon,\mathbf{w}_\infty}$ by $\mathcal{F}_{\pi_f,\epsilon}$, similarly for the normalized maps, as well as $p^\epsilon(\pi_f, \mathbf{w}_\infty)$ by $p^\epsilon(\pi_f)$, while keeping in mind that $\mathbf{w}_\infty$ has been chosen already. (For example, in the classical setting of modular forms, this is equivalent to fixing a generator $\mathbf{w}_\infty$ for H^1 of the discrete series representation of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ of lowest weight k, and now for all weight k modular forms we work with this choice of $\mathbf{w}_\infty$.)

In terms of the un-normalized maps, we can describe the above commutative diagram by

$$\sigma \circ \mathcal{F}_{\pi_f,\epsilon} = \left(\frac{\sigma(p^\epsilon(\pi_f))}{p^{\epsilon^\sigma}(\pi_f^\sigma)} \right) \mathcal{F}_{\pi_f^\sigma,\epsilon^\sigma} \circ \sigma. \tag{2.2.6}$$

The periods $p^\epsilon(\pi_f)$ are expected to be intimately related to the special values of the L-function $L_f(s,\pi)$ attached to π_f; indeed, this is one of the main motivations for this paper. Making this relation explicit is part of a future work which we hope to report on in another paper. If $F = \mathbb{Q}$, this is the main thrust of the work of Mahnkopf [24]. Roughly speaking, the quantity $\Omega_\epsilon(\pi,\pi',\eta)$ that shows up in [24, Theorem 5.4]–the main theorem of that paper–is given by

$$\Omega_\epsilon(\pi,\pi',\eta) = \frac{p^\epsilon(\pi_f)p^{\epsilon'}(\pi'_f)}{L(0,\pi\times(\pi'\otimes\eta))}.$$

For the precise definition of $\Omega_\epsilon(\pi,\pi',\eta)$, which is considerably more involved and quite delicate, see [24, (5.11)]. (In §4.3 we discuss a little more about certain issues posed by this auxiliary character η.)

Before we end this subsection we note that there is another approach to get an E-structure on Whittaker models. By using Waldspurger [39, Lemme I.1] we get that there is an E-structure generated by all the local new vectors. It is an interesting exercise to compare the two different E-structures on $W(\pi_f)$ because that gives a *period* associated to π_f (which is quite different from the Harder or Mahnkopf type periods). Whether this period has anything to do with special values of the L-function associated to π is not clear at the moment.

2.3. **Behaviour under twisting.** The motivation for this section comes from our earlier work [29]. We formulated a conjecture which relates the special values of $L(s,\mathrm{Sym}^n\varphi,\xi)$–the symmetric power L-function of a holomorphic cusp form φ twisted by a Dirichlet character ξ–to the special values of $L(s,\mathrm{Sym}^n\varphi)$. We predict therein that a certain explicit power of the Gauss sum of ξ relates the two special values. (See [29, Conjecture 7.1].) Assuming Langlands' principle of functoriality, this conjecture would *follow* if we can prove a similar statement on the relation between the special values of $L(s,\pi\otimes\xi)$, for a cuspidal representation π of $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{A}_\mathbb{Q})$, and the special values of $L(s,\pi)$ itself. In view of the work of Mahnkopf, this translates to proving a similar relation between the periods $P(\widetilde{\pi\otimes\xi})$ and $P(\tilde{\pi})$ associated by Mahnkopf to $\pi\otimes\xi$ and π respectively. This relation would roughly take the form

$$P(\widetilde{\pi\otimes\xi}) \sim P(\tilde{\pi})$$

where $\sim$ means up to some algebraic quantities over which one hopes to have as much control as possible.

The main aim of this section is to prove such a result for the periods $p^\epsilon(\pi_f)$ that we defined in the previous section. Albeit this statement is not trivial to prove, it should not be philosophically surprising, because, it seems unlikely to be able to introduce new transcendental quantities if one only allows twisting by 'algebraic' characters. In a classical context, one should view this as that the transcendental part of the special value $L(2m, \chi)$, for an even Dirichlet character χ and an integer $m \geq 1$, is already captured by the special value $\zeta(2m)$ of the Riemann zeta function; and the quotient of the two special values is basically the Gauss sum of χ. See [29, §7] for a discussion of such and other classical examples.

Before we state and prove the main theorem, we need some preliminaries on Hecke characters and their Gauss sums. We keep all the notation introduced so far. Let ξ be a Hecke character of F, and let ξ^0 be the associated primitive Hecke character and let the conductor of ξ^0 (and hence of ξ) be $\mathfrak{c}$. Let $\mathcal{D}_F$ be the absolute different of F, and let $y \in \mathfrak{c}^{-1}\mathcal{D}_F^{-1}$. Define the Gauss sum of ξ by

$$\gamma(\xi_f, y) := \gamma(\xi_f^0, y) = \sum_{x \in (\mathcal{O}_F/\mathfrak{c})^\times} \xi_f(x) e^{2\pi i \, T_{F/\mathbb{Q}}(xy)}.$$

In the right hand side, ξ_f is the finite part of the Größencharakter ξ. This definition is slightly different from [27, VII.6.3] and is more like the definition of Gauss sum used by Shimura [34, p.784]. Observe that $\gamma(\xi_f, y)$ depends only on the class of y in $\mathfrak{c}^{-1}\mathcal{D}_F^{-1}/\mathcal{D}_F^{-1}$. Given a ξ, we will arbitrarily pick such an element y for which $\gamma(\xi_f, y) \neq 0$. Having chosen y for ξ, we will work with the same y for every character of the form ξ^σ, where $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{C})$. This choice will not affect us in any serious way, because we will really be concerned with certain quotients involving Gauss sums, and such quotients will not depend on y. (See Lemma 2.3.4 below.) In the notation we will therefore suppress the dependence on y, and denote *the Gauss sum* of ξ by $\gamma(\xi_f)$.

Given a Hecke character ξ, we define its signature $\epsilon_\xi = (\epsilon_{\xi,v})_{v \in S_r} \in \{\pm 1\}^{r_1}$ as follows. For $v \in S_r$, define $\epsilon_{\xi,v} = \xi_v(-1)$. We will think of ϵ_ξ as a character of K_∞/K_∞^0. We can now state and prove one of the main results of this paper.

Theorem 2.3.1. *Let F be a number field and π be a regular algebraic cuspidal automorphic representation of $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{A}_F)$. Let μ be a dominant algebraic character of T_∞ such that $\pi \in Coh(G, \mu^\vee)$. Let ϵ be a character of K_∞/K_∞^0 as in §2, and let $p^\epsilon(\pi_f)$ be the period as in Definition 2.2.5. Let ξ be an algebraic Hecke character of F with signature ϵ_ξ. Then $\pi \otimes \xi$ is also a regular algebraic cuspidal automorphic representation, and the signature $\epsilon \cdot \epsilon_\xi := \epsilon \otimes \epsilon_\xi$ is a character of K_∞/K_∞^0 that is permissible for $\pi \otimes \xi$ (which is an issue only when n is odd), hence the period $p^{\epsilon \cdot \epsilon_\xi}(\pi_f \otimes \xi_f)$ is defined. We have the following relations:*

(1) *For any* $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{C})$ *we have*

$$\sigma\left(\frac{p^{\epsilon\cdot\epsilon_\xi}(\pi_f\otimes\xi_f)}{\gamma(\xi_f)^{-n(n-1)/2}\,p^{\epsilon}(\pi_f)}\right) = \left(\frac{p^{\epsilon^\sigma\cdot\epsilon_{\xi^\sigma}}(\pi_f^\sigma\otimes\xi_f^\sigma)}{\gamma(\xi_f^\sigma)^{-n(n-1)/2}\,p^{\epsilon^\sigma}(\pi_f^\sigma)}\right).$$

(2) *Let* $\mathbb{Q}(\pi_f,\xi_f)$ *denote the compositum of the (number) fields* $\mathbb{Q}(\pi_f)$ *and* $\mathbb{Q}(\xi_f)$. *We have*

$$p^{\epsilon\cdot\epsilon_\xi}(\pi_f\otimes\xi_f) \sim_{\mathbb{Q}(\pi_f,\xi_f)} \gamma(\xi_f)^{-n(n-1)/2}\,p^{\epsilon}(\pi_f).$$

By $\sim_{\mathbb{Q}(\pi_f,\xi_f)}$ *we mean up to an element of* $\mathbb{Q}(\pi_f,\xi_f)$.

Proof. Note that (1) ⇒ (2) follows from the definitions of the rationality field of π_f and ξ_f. It is really statement (1) which takes some work to prove; this entails an analysis of the following diagram of maps. *Warning:* This diagram is not commutative! Indeed, the various complex numbers involved in (1) measure the failure of commutativity of this diagram.

(2.3.2)

$$\begin{tikzcd}
& W(\pi_f) \arrow[rrr, "\mathcal{F}_{\pi_f,\epsilon}"] \arrow[d, "W_{\xi_f}"] \arrow[ddl, "\sigma"'] & & & H^b(V_\pi\otimes M_\mu^\vee)(\epsilon) \arrow[d, "(A_\xi\otimes 1_{M_\mu^\vee})^*"] \arrow[ddll, "\sigma"'] \\
& W(\pi_f\otimes\xi_f) \arrow[rrr, "\mathcal{F}_{\pi_f\otimes\xi_f,\epsilon\cdot\epsilon_\xi}"] \arrow[ddl] & & & H^b(V_{\pi\otimes\xi}\otimes(M_\mu^\vee\otimes\xi_\infty^{-1}))(\epsilon\cdot\epsilon_\xi) \arrow[ddll, "\sigma"'] \\
W(\pi_f^\sigma) \arrow[rr, "\mathcal{F}_{\pi_f^\sigma,\epsilon^\sigma}", "\sigma"'] \arrow[d, "W_{\xi_f^\sigma}"'] & & H^b(V_{\pi^\sigma}\otimes M_{\mu^\sigma}^\vee)(\epsilon^\sigma) \arrow[d, "(A_{\xi^\sigma}\otimes 1_{M_{\mu^\sigma}^\vee})^*"'] & & \\
W(\pi_f^\sigma\otimes\xi_f^\sigma) \arrow[rr, "\mathcal{F}_{\pi_f^\sigma\otimes\xi_f^\sigma,\epsilon^\sigma\cdot\epsilon_{\xi^\sigma}}"] & & H^b(V_{\pi^\sigma\otimes\xi^\sigma}\otimes(M_{\mu^\sigma}^\vee\otimes\xi_\infty^{-\sigma}))(\epsilon^\sigma\cdot\epsilon_{\xi^\sigma}) & &
\end{tikzcd}$$

We need to explain the undefined and abbreviated notations in the above diagram. We have abbreviated $H^b(\mathfrak{g}_\infty, K_\infty^0; V_\pi\otimes M_\mu^\vee)(\epsilon)$ as $H^b(V_\pi\otimes M_\mu^\vee)(\epsilon)$. Same remark applies to three other objects. The maps W_ξ and A_ξ are defined as follows. If w is any Whittaker function for $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{A})$, then define

$$W_\xi(w)(g) = \xi(\det(g))w(g)$$

for all $g \in \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{A})$. It is easy to see that W_ξ maps $W(\pi)$ onto $W(\pi\otimes\xi)$. An identical formula defines W_{ξ_f} and W_{ξ_∞}. Similarly, we define $A_\xi(\phi)$ for any automorphic form ϕ on $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{A})$ by

$$A_\xi(\phi)(g) = \xi(\det(g))\phi(g)$$

for all $g \in \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{A})$. It is easy to see that A_ξ maps V_π onto $V_{\pi\otimes\xi}$. The identity map on the vector space $M_\mu^\vee$ is denoted $1_{M_\mu^\vee}$. Observe that $A_\xi\otimes 1_{M_\mu^\vee}$ is a G_∞-equivariant isomorphism from $V_\pi\otimes M_\mu^\vee$ onto $V_{\pi\otimes\xi}\otimes(M_\mu^\vee\otimes\xi_\infty^{-1})$, and we denote $(A_\xi\otimes 1_{M_\mu^\vee})^*$ the map induced by $A_\xi\otimes 1_{M_\mu^\vee}$ in cohomology.

Analyzing the diagram involves an analysis of certain subdiagrams. Some of these are independently interesting, and so we delineate them in the following propositions. There are three propositions below which give information about (non-)commutativity of some of the faces of (2.3.2).

Proposition 2.3.3. *Let* π *be a cuspidal automorphic representation of* $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{A})$. *Let* ξ *be a Hecke character of* F. *Then for any* $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{C})$ *we have*

$$\sigma \circ W_{\xi_f} = \sigma(\xi_f(t_\sigma^{-n(n-1)/2}))\, W_{\xi_f^\sigma} \circ \sigma.$$

Proof. Consider the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
W(\pi_f) \arrow[r, "\sigma"] \arrow[d, "W_{\xi_f}"] & W(\pi_f^\sigma) \arrow[d, "W_{\xi_f^\sigma}"] \\
W(\pi_f \otimes \xi_f) \arrow[r, "\sigma"] & W(\pi_f^\sigma \otimes \xi_f^\sigma)
\end{tikzcd}$$

Let $w \in W(\pi_f)$. We will chase this element w in the above diagram. For all $g \in G(\mathbb{A}_f)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma(W_{\xi_f}(w))(g) &= \sigma(W_{\xi_f}(w)(t_{\sigma,n}g)) \\
&= \sigma(\xi_f(\det(t_{\sigma,n}g))w(t_{\sigma,n}g)) \\
&= \sigma(\xi_f(t_\sigma^{-n(n-1)/2}))\sigma(\xi_f(\det(g)))\sigma(w(t_{\sigma,n}g)).
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
W_{\xi_f^\sigma}(\sigma(w))(g) &= \xi_f^\sigma(\det(g))\sigma(w)(g) \\
&= \sigma(\xi_f(\det(g)))\sigma(w(t_{\sigma,n}g)).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\sigma((W_{\xi_f}(w)) = \sigma(\xi_f(t_\sigma^{-n(n-1)/2}))W_{\xi_f^\sigma}(\sigma(w)).$$

(This measures the failure of commutativity of the above diagram.) $\square$

Lemma 2.3.4.

$$\sigma(\xi_f(t_\sigma^{-1})) = \frac{\sigma(\gamma(\xi_f))}{\gamma(\xi_f^\sigma)}.$$

Proof. Using the definition of t_σ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(\gamma(\xi_f)) &= \sigma(\gamma(\xi_f, y)) = \sum_{x \in (\mathcal{O}_F/\mathfrak{c})^\times} \sigma(\xi_f(x))\sigma(e^{2\pi i\, T_{F/\mathbb{Q}}(xy)}) \\ &= \sum_{x \in (\mathcal{O}_F/\mathfrak{c})^\times} \sigma(\xi_f(x)) e^{2\pi i t_\sigma\, T_{F/\mathbb{Q}}(xy)}, \\ &= \sum_{x \in (\mathcal{O}_F/\mathfrak{c})^\times} \sigma(\xi_f(x)) e^{2\pi i\, T_{F/\mathbb{Q}}(t_\sigma xy)}, \\ &= \sum_{x \in (\mathcal{O}_F/\mathfrak{c})^\times} \sigma(\xi_f(t_\sigma^{-1}x)) e^{2\pi i\, T_{F/\mathbb{Q}}(xy)} = \sigma(\xi_f(t_\sigma^{-1}))\gamma(\xi_f^\sigma). \end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 2.3.5.

$$\sigma \circ W_{\xi_f} = \left(\frac{\sigma(\gamma(\xi_f))}{\gamma(\xi_f^\sigma)} \right)^{n(n-1)/2} W_{\xi_f^\sigma} \circ \sigma.$$

Proof. Follows from Proposition 2.3.3 and Lemma 2.3.4. □

Proposition 2.3.6. *Let* π *be a regular algebraic cuspidal automorphic representation of* $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{A})$*, and let* $\mu \in X^+(T_\infty)$ *be such that* $\pi \in \mathrm{Coh}(G, \mu^\vee)$*. For any algebraic Hecke character* ξ *we have*

$$\sigma \circ (A_\xi \otimes 1_{M_\mu^\vee})^* = (A_{\xi^\sigma} \otimes 1_{M_{\mu^\sigma}^\vee})^* \circ \sigma.$$

Proof. This proof is a little more involved, and to help the reader, we adumbrate it as follows. First go up to a bigger ambient vector space ($H^*_{dR}(\tilde{S}, \mathcal{M})$) and then use an identification of this bigger space with another space ($H^*_B(\tilde{S}, \mathcal{M})$) where it will be obvious that a lift of A^*_ξ is Galois equivariant, and hence so is the original A^*_ξ. During the course of the proof, it helps to keep the following scheme of spaces and maps in mind.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
H^b(\mathfrak{g}_\infty, K^0_\infty; V_\pi \otimes M^\vee_\mu)(\epsilon) \arrow[r, phantom, "\simeq"] \arrow[d] & H^b_{\mathrm{cusp}}(\tilde{S}, \mathcal{M}^\vee_\mu)(\tilde{\pi}) \arrow[d] & \\
H^b(\mathfrak{g}_\infty, K^0_\infty; \mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{cusp}}(G(F)\backslash G(\mathbb{A})) \otimes M^\vee_\mu) \arrow[r, phantom, "\simeq"] \arrow[d] & H^b_{\mathrm{cusp}}(\tilde{S}, \mathcal{M}^\vee_\mu) \arrow[d] & \\
H^b(\mathfrak{g}_\infty, K^0_\infty; C^\infty(G(F)\backslash G(\mathbb{A})) \otimes M^\vee_\mu) \arrow[r, phantom, "\simeq"] & H^b_{dR}(\tilde{S}, \mathcal{M}^\vee_\mu) \arrow[r, phantom, "\simeq"] & H^b_B(\tilde{S}, \mathcal{M}^\vee_\mu)
\end{tikzcd}$$

where all the vertical arrows are inclusions. Indeed, the rational structures on all the above spaces comes from a rational structure on the Betti cohomology space on which it is very easy to describe an action of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{C})$ (see [7, p.128]). In the above scheme, we need not (and so did not) refer to cohomology with compact supports because one has [7, p.129]

$$H^*_{\mathrm{cusp}} \hookrightarrow H^*_c \to H^*_! := \mathrm{Image}(H^*_c \to H^*_{\mathrm{dR}})$$

and the composite is an injection, i.e., $H^*_{\mathrm{cusp}} \hookrightarrow H^*_!$, and hence $H^*_{\mathrm{cusp}} \hookrightarrow H^*_{\mathrm{dR}}$.

To begin the proof of Proposition 2.3.6, observe that the map $(A_\xi \otimes 1_{M_\mu^\vee})^*$ in the statement of the proposition is the restriction to $H^b(\mathfrak{g}_\infty, K^0_\infty; V_\pi \otimes M_\mu^\vee)(\epsilon)$ of the map

$$({}_{\mathcal{A}}A_\xi \otimes 1_{M_\mu^\vee})^* : H^b(\mathfrak{g}_\infty, K^0_\infty; \mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{cusp}}(G(F)\backslash G(\mathbb{A})) \otimes M_\mu^\vee) \to H^b(\mathfrak{g}_\infty, K^0_\infty; \mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{cusp}}(G(F)\backslash G(\mathbb{A})) \otimes (M_\mu^\vee \otimes \xi_\infty^{-1}))$$

induced by A_ξ on $\mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{cusp}}(G(F)\backslash G(\mathbb{A}))$. From a fundamental theorem of Borel [4], cohomology with coefficients in the space of cusp forms injects into cohomology with coefficients in the space of smooth functions, and the above map $({}_{\mathcal{A}}A_\xi \otimes 1_{M_\mu^\vee})^*$ is the restriction to $H^b(\mathfrak{g}_\infty, K^0_\infty; \mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{cusp}}(G(F)\backslash G(\mathbb{A})) \otimes M_\mu^\vee)$ of the map

$$({}_{C^\infty}A_\xi \otimes 1_{M_\mu^\vee})^* : H^b(\mathfrak{g}_\infty, K^0_\infty; C^\infty(G(F)\backslash G(\mathbb{A})) \otimes M_\mu^\vee) \to H^b(\mathfrak{g}_\infty, K^0_\infty; C^\infty(G(F)\backslash G(\mathbb{A})) \otimes (M_\mu^\vee \otimes \xi_\infty^{-1}))$$

induced by A_ξ on $C^\infty(G(F)\backslash G(\mathbb{A}))$.

On the other hand, relative Lie algebra cohomology can be identified with de Rham cohomology, and we can transport the map $({}_{C^\infty}A_\xi \otimes 1_{M_\mu^\vee})^*$ across to get

$${}_{dR}A^*_\xi : H^b_{dR}(\tilde{S}, \mathcal{M}_\mu^\vee) \to H^b_{dR}(\tilde{S}, \mathcal{M}_\mu^\vee \otimes \xi_\infty^{-1}).$$

(By $\mathcal{M}_\mu^\vee \otimes \xi_\infty^{-1}$ we mean the locally constant sheaf induced by the representation $M_\mu^\vee \otimes \xi_\infty^{-1}$.) We can describe the map ${}_{dR}A^*_\xi$ as follows. Let K_f be an open compact subgroup of $G(\mathbb{A}_f)$ such that $\xi(\det(k)) = 1$ for all $k \in K_f$. Recall the identification ([22, §1.1])

$$H^b_{dR}(S(K_f), \mathcal{M}_\mu^\vee) \simeq H^b(\mathfrak{g}_\infty, K^0_\infty; C^\infty(G(F)\backslash G(\mathbb{A}))^{K_f} \otimes M_\mu^\vee).$$

The choice of K_f implies that A_ξ stabilizes $C^\infty(G(\mathbb{Q})\backslash G(\mathbb{A}))^{K_f}$ and so induces a map $({}_{C^\infty}A_{\xi,K_f} \otimes 1_{M_\mu^\vee})^*$ on the right hand side above. Clearly, $\varinjlim_{K_f} ({}_{C^\infty}A_{\xi,K_f} \otimes 1_{M_\mu^\vee})^* = ({}_{C^\infty}A_\xi \otimes 1_{M_\mu^\vee})^*$. Moving across to de Rham cohomology, we can describe the map ${}_{dR}A^*_{\xi,K_f}$ as acting on differential forms by *pointwise multiplication by* ξ, i.e., if ω is a $\mathcal{M}_\mu^\vee$-valued (closed) differential form of degree b on $S(K_f)$ then

$${}_{dR}A^*_{\xi,K_f}(\omega)_{\underline{g}} = \xi(\det(g))\omega_{\underline{g}}$$

for any $g \in \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{A})$, where $\underline{g}$ is the image of g in $S(K_f)$. (For any $x \in S(K_f)$, by ω_x we mean the value at x of ω which is a section of the b-th exterior of the cotangent bundle twisted by $\mathcal{M}_\mu^\vee$ over the manifold $S(K_f)$.) Observe that the above equation is well defined. Passing to the limit we get the map ${}_{dR}A^*_\xi = \varinjlim {}_{dR}A^*_{\xi,K_f}$.

Now we move across to Betti cohomology via the de Rham isomorphism, and get a map

$${}_{B}A^*_\xi : H^b_{B}(\tilde{S}, \mathcal{M}_\mu^\vee) \to H^b_{B}(\tilde{S}, \mathcal{M}_\mu^\vee \otimes \xi_\infty^{-1}).$$

The point of going to Betti cohomology is because the action of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{C})$ is especially simple to describe–it acts by acting on the coefficient system. (See [7, page 128].) Namely, if $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{C})$ then we have a σ linear isomorphism

$$H^*_B(S(K_f), \mathcal{M}_\mu^\vee) \to H^*_B(S(K_f), \mathcal{M}_{\mu^\sigma}^\vee).$$

This isomorphism is the one induced in cohomology by the following map on the singular cochain complex

$$\Delta^*(S(K_f), \mathcal{M}_\mu^\vee) \to \Delta^*(S(K_f), \mathcal{M}_{\mu^\sigma}^\vee)$$

which is simply $\tau \mapsto l_\sigma \circ \tau$, if l_σ is the σ-linear isomorphism from $M_\mu^\vee$ to $M_{\mu^\sigma}^\vee$. (Recall that $M_\mu^\vee$ is defined over $\mathbb{Q}$ and that the action of σ on μ is via the embeddings of F into $\mathbb{C}$.) The action of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{C})$ on $H_B^*(S(K_f), \mathcal{M}_\mu^\vee)$ can be transported to an action on $H_{dR}^*(S(K_f), \mathcal{M}_\mu^\vee)$, and after passing to the limit, induces an action of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{C})$ on each of the spaces

$$H^*(\mathfrak{g}_\infty, K_\infty^0, V_\pi \otimes M_\mu^\vee)(\epsilon) \subset H_{\mathrm{cusp}}^*(\tilde{S}, \mathcal{M}_\mu^\vee) \subset H_{dR}^*(\tilde{S}, \mathcal{M}_\mu^\vee).$$

The statement in the proposition may be phrased as that the map $(A_\xi \otimes 1_{M_\mu^\vee})^*$ is $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{C})$-equivariant. From the above description of the action of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{C})$, we can see that the $(A_\xi \otimes 1_{M_\mu^\vee})^*$ is $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{C})$-equivariant if and only if any of the maps $({}_{\mathcal{A}}A_\xi \otimes 1_{M_\mu^\vee})^*$, $({}_{C^\infty}A_\xi \otimes 1_{M_\mu^\vee})^*$, ${}_{dR}A_\xi^*$ or ${}_{B}A_\xi^*$ is $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{C})$-equivariant.

It is easy to see that the map ${}_{dR}A_\xi^*$ is $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{C})$-equivariant, since $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{C})$ acts on the coefficient system, and ${}_{dR}A_\xi^*$ is more intrinsic to the manifold. More precisely, consider the de Rham map $\Omega^*(S(K_f), \mathcal{M}_\mu^\vee) \to \Delta^*(S(K_f), \mathcal{M}_\mu^\vee)$ from the space of differential forms to the space of singular cochains, given by integration. (This induces the de Rham isomorphism in cohomology.) We can describe the action of $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{C})$ on $\omega \in \Omega^b(S(K_f), \mathcal{M}_\mu^\vee)$, by $\sigma(\omega)_x = l_\sigma \circ \omega_x$ for $x \in S(K_f)$. For any $g \in \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{A})$, if $\underline{g}$ denotes the image of g in $S(K_f)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma({}_{dR}A_{\xi,K_f}(\omega))_{\underline{g}} &= l_\sigma \circ {}_{dR}A_{\xi,K_f}(\omega)_{\underline{g}} = l_\sigma \circ \xi(\det(g))\omega_{\underline{g}} \\ &= \sigma(\xi(\det(g)))l_\sigma \circ \omega_{\underline{g}} = {}_{dR}A_{\xi^\sigma,K_f}(\sigma(\omega))_{\underline{g}}.\end{aligned}$$

In other words, $\sigma \circ {}_{dR}A_{\xi,K_f} = {}_{dR}A_{\xi^\sigma,K_f} \circ \sigma$. Passing to the limit over all K_f, we get $\sigma \circ {}_{dR}A_\xi = {}_{dR}A_{\xi^\sigma} \circ \sigma$, which induces the desired equality of maps in cohomology. □

Proposition 2.3.7. *The diagram*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
W(\pi_f) \arrow[r, "\mathcal{F}_{\pi_f,\epsilon}"] \arrow[d, "W_{\xi_f}"] & H^b(\mathfrak{g}_\infty, K_\infty^0; V_\pi \otimes M_\mu^\vee)(\epsilon) \arrow[d, "(A_\xi \otimes 1_{M_\mu^\vee})^*"] \\
W(\pi_f \otimes \xi_f) \arrow[r, "\mathcal{F}_{\pi_f \otimes \xi_f, \epsilon\cdot\epsilon_\xi}"] & H^b(\mathfrak{g}_\infty, K_\infty^0; V_{\pi\otimes\xi} \otimes (M_\mu^\vee \otimes \xi_\infty^{-1}))(\epsilon \cdot \epsilon_\xi)
\end{tikzcd}$$

commutes. (The horizontal maps are the un-normalized maps.)

Proof. That this diagram commutes can be seen by observing that the following three diagrams commute, since the horizontal maps are both the compositum of three maps.

(For brevity we denote $H^b(-)$ for $H^b(\mathfrak{g}_\infty, K_\infty^0; -)$.)

(2.3.8)
$$\begin{tikzcd}
W(\pi_f) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "W_{\xi_f}"] & W(\pi_f) \otimes H^b(W(\pi_\infty) \otimes M_\mu^\vee)(\epsilon) \arrow[d, "W_{\xi_f} \otimes (W_{\xi_\infty} \otimes 1_{M_\mu^\vee})^*"] \\
W(\pi_f \otimes \xi_f) \arrow[r] & W(\pi_f \otimes \xi_f) \otimes H^b(W(\pi_\infty \otimes \xi_\infty) \otimes (M_\mu^\vee \otimes \xi_\infty^{-1}))(\epsilon \cdot \epsilon_\xi)
\end{tikzcd}$$

(2.3.9)
$$\begin{tikzcd}
W(\pi_f) \otimes H^b(W(\pi_\infty) \otimes M_\mu^\vee)(\epsilon) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "W_{\xi_f} \otimes (W_{\xi_\infty} \otimes 1_{M_\mu^\vee})^*"] & H^b(W(\pi) \otimes M_\mu^\vee)(\epsilon) \arrow[d, "(W_\xi \otimes 1_{M_\mu^\vee})^*"] \\
W(\pi_f \otimes \xi_f) \otimes H^b(W(\pi_\infty \otimes \xi_\infty) \otimes (M_\mu^\vee \otimes \xi_\infty^{-1}))(\epsilon \cdot \epsilon_\xi) \arrow[r] & H^b(W(\pi \otimes \xi) \otimes (M_\mu^\vee \otimes \xi_\infty^{-1}))(\epsilon \cdot \epsilon_\xi)
\end{tikzcd}$$

(2.3.10)
$$\begin{tikzcd}
H^b(W(\pi) \otimes M_\mu^\vee)(\epsilon) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "(W_\xi \otimes 1_{M_\mu^\vee})^*"] & H^b(V_\pi \otimes M_\mu^\vee)(\epsilon) \arrow[d, "(A_\xi \otimes 1_{M_\mu^\vee})^*"] \\
H^b(W(\pi \otimes \xi) \otimes (M_\mu^\vee \otimes \xi^{-1}))(\epsilon \cdot \epsilon_\xi) \arrow[r] & H^b(V_{\pi \otimes \xi} \otimes (M_\mu^\vee \otimes \xi_\infty^{-1}))(\epsilon \cdot \epsilon_\xi)
\end{tikzcd}$$

For the commutativity of (2.3.8), note that the linear map W_{ξ_∞} induces a G_∞-equivariant isomorphism $W_{\xi_\infty} \otimes 1_{M_\mu^\vee} : W(\pi_\infty) \otimes M_\mu^\vee \to W(\pi_\infty \otimes \xi_\infty) \otimes (M_\mu^\vee \otimes \xi_\infty^{-1})$, and hence induces an isomorphism $(W_{\xi_\infty} \otimes 1_{M_\mu^\vee})^*$ in cohomology. From the choice we made on the generators of such one dimensional cohomology spaces we have $(W_{\xi_\infty} \otimes 1_{M_\mu^\vee})^*(\mathbf{w}(\pi_\infty, \epsilon)) = \mathbf{w}(\pi_\infty \otimes \xi_\infty, \epsilon \cdot \epsilon_\xi)$. Now it is easy to check that (2.3.8) commutes. The diagram in (2.3.9) is the one induced in cohomology of the commuative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
W(\pi_f) \otimes W(\pi_\infty) \otimes M_\mu^\vee \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "W_{\xi_f} \otimes W_{\xi_\infty} \otimes 1_{M_\mu^\vee}"] & W(\pi) \otimes M_\mu^\vee \arrow[d, "W_\xi \otimes 1_{M_\mu^\vee}"] \\
W(\pi_f \otimes \xi_f) \otimes W(\pi_\infty \otimes \xi_\infty) \otimes (M_\mu^\vee \otimes \xi_\infty^{-1}) \arrow[r] & W(\pi \otimes \xi) \otimes (M_\mu^\vee \otimes \xi_\infty^{-1})
\end{tikzcd}$$

and hence (2.3.9) commutes. Finally, the diagram in (2.3.10) is the one induced in cohomology of the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
W(\pi) \otimes M_\mu^\vee \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "W_\xi \otimes 1_{M_\mu^\vee}"] & V_\pi \otimes M_\mu^\vee \arrow[d, "A_\xi \otimes 1_{M_\mu^\vee}"] \\
W(\pi \otimes \xi) \otimes (M_\mu^\vee \otimes \xi_\infty^{-1}) \arrow[r] & V_{\pi \otimes \xi} \otimes (M_\mu^\vee \otimes \xi_\infty^{-1})
\end{tikzcd}$$

where the horizontal maps are the inverses of taking the Fourier coefficients. If the Fourier coeffcient map $V_\pi \to W(\pi) = W(\pi, \psi)$ is denoted $\phi \mapsto w_\psi(\phi)$, where

$$w_\psi(\phi)(g) = \int_{N(F)\backslash N(\mathbb{A})} \phi(ng)\overline{\psi(n)}\, dn$$

then it is easy to see that $w_\psi(\phi \otimes \xi) = w_\psi(\phi) \otimes \xi$, hence this last diagram commutes. □

We can now finish the proof of Theorem 2.3.1 as follows. We consider the composite map $(A_{\xi^\sigma} \otimes 1_{M^\vee_{\mu^\sigma}})^* \circ \sigma \circ \mathcal{F}_{\pi_f,\epsilon}$ in the diagram (2.3.2). On the one hand, using Equation 2.2.6 and Proposition 2.3.7, we have

$$\begin{aligned}(A_{\xi^\sigma} \otimes 1_{M^\vee_{\mu^\sigma}})^* \circ \sigma \circ \mathcal{F}_{\pi_f,\epsilon} &= (A_{\xi^\sigma} \otimes 1_{M^\vee_{\mu^\sigma}})^* \circ \left(\frac{\sigma(p^\epsilon(\pi_f)}{p^{\epsilon^\sigma}(\pi_f^\sigma)}\right) \mathcal{F}_{\pi_f^\sigma,\epsilon^\sigma} \circ \sigma \\ &= \left(\frac{\sigma(p^\epsilon(\pi_f))}{p^{\epsilon^\sigma}(\pi_f^\sigma)}\right) \mathcal{F}_{\pi_f^\sigma \otimes \xi_f^\sigma, \epsilon^\sigma \cdot \epsilon_{\xi^\sigma}} \circ W_{\xi_f^\sigma} \circ \sigma.\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, using Propositions 2.3.6, 2.3.7, Equation 2.2.6 and Corollary 2.3.5 (in that order), we have

$$\begin{aligned}(A_{\xi^\sigma} \otimes 1_{M^\vee_{\mu^\sigma}})^* \circ \sigma \circ \mathcal{F}_{\pi_f,\epsilon} &= \sigma \circ (A_\xi \otimes 1_{M^\vee_\mu})^* \circ \mathcal{F}_{\pi_f,\epsilon} \\ &= \sigma \circ \mathcal{F}_{\pi_f \otimes \xi_f, \epsilon \cdot \epsilon_\xi} \circ W_{\xi_f} \\ &= \left(\frac{\sigma(p^{\epsilon\cdot\epsilon_\xi}(\pi_f \otimes \xi_f))}{p^{\epsilon^\sigma\cdot\epsilon_{\xi^\sigma}}(\pi_f^\sigma \otimes \xi_f^\sigma)}\right) \mathcal{F}_{\pi_f^\sigma \otimes \xi_f^\sigma, \epsilon^\sigma \cdot \epsilon_{\xi^\sigma}} \circ \sigma \circ W_{\xi_f} \\ &= \left(\frac{\sigma(p^{\epsilon\cdot\epsilon_\xi}(\pi_f \otimes \xi_f))}{p^{\epsilon^\sigma\cdot\epsilon_{\xi^\sigma}}(\pi_f^\sigma \otimes \xi_f^\sigma)}\right) \left(\frac{\sigma(\gamma(\xi_f))}{\gamma(\xi_f^\sigma)}\right)^{n(n-1)/2} \mathcal{F}_{\pi_f^\sigma \otimes \xi_f^\sigma, \epsilon^\sigma \cdot \epsilon_{\xi^\sigma}} \circ W_{\xi_f^\sigma} \circ \sigma.\end{aligned}$$

Putting both together we have

$$\frac{\sigma(p^\epsilon(\pi_f))}{p^{\epsilon^\sigma}(\pi_f^\sigma)} = \left(\frac{\sigma(p^{\epsilon\cdot\epsilon_\xi}(\pi_f \otimes \xi_f))}{p^{\epsilon^\sigma\cdot\epsilon_{\xi^\sigma}}(\pi_f^\sigma \otimes \xi_f^\sigma)}\right) \left(\frac{\sigma(\gamma(\xi_f))}{\gamma(\xi_f^\sigma)}\right)^{n(n-1)/2}$$

from which the theorem follows. □

2.4. **Some remarks.**

Remark 2.4.1. The reader should compare Theorem 2.3.1 with the conjectures of Blasius [3] and Panchiskin [28], on the behaviour of Deligne's motivically defined periods upon twisting a given motive by Artin motives. (A finite order Hecke character is an example of an Artin motive.)

Remark 2.4.2. Suppose π is an algebraic cuspidal representation of $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{A}_F)$, and suppose $M = M(\pi)$ is the conjectural motive attached to π as in [7, Conjecture 4.5]. A very interesting question (modulo this conjecture) is to understand how the periods $p^\epsilon(\pi_f)$ considered above compare with Deligne's periods $c^\pm(M)$ attached to

M. (See [8].) This is related to the issue of factorization of Deligne's periods over the infinite places as in Blasius [3, M.8]. The question is even more delicate than just a factorization issue, because according to [8, Conjecture 2.8], Deligne's periods are meant to capture the transcendental part of the special values of the motivic L-function $L(s, M)$, however, Mahnkopf's work [24] suggests that the transcendental part of the special values of $L(s, \pi_f)$ depends not only on the periods $p^{\epsilon}(\pi_f)$, but also on the periods attached to a sequence of representations π_i of $\mathrm{GL}_{n-2i}(\mathbb{A}_F)$ for $1 \leq i < n/2$.

Example 2.4.3 (Special case of Tate's conjecture)**.** Consider Theorem 2.3.1 in the following special case: Let F be a real quadratic extension of $\mathbb{Q}$. Let K/F be a totally imaginary quadratic extension. Let χ be a Hecke character of K which is $\mathrm{Gal}(K/F)$-regular, and let $\pi = \mathrm{AI}_{K/F}(\chi)$ be the cuspidal automorphic representation of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{A}_F)$ obtained by automorphic induction. Assume that the infinity type of χ is so arranged that π is algebraic and regular. Note that $\pi \simeq \pi \otimes \omega_{K/F}$, where $\omega_{K/F}$ is the quadratic Hecke character of F associated to K/F by class field theory. If we denote a signature $\epsilon = (\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2)$ with $\epsilon_i = \pm$ (instead of $1\!\!1$ or sgn as before), then the signature of $\omega_{K/F}$ is $(-,-)$. In this setting, Theorem 2.3.1 gives

$$p^{++}(\pi_f)/p^{--}(\pi_f) \sim \gamma(\omega_{K/F}), \quad p^{+-}(\pi_f)/p^{-+}(\pi_f) \sim \gamma(\omega_{K/F}).$$

A Hilbert modular form over F of CM type corresponds to such a representation and the above period relations are formally the same relations proved by Murty and Ramakrishnan. (See [26, Theorem A].) Such a period relation is one of the main ingredients for them to prove Tate's conjecture in a special case.

3. DELIGNE'S CONJECTURE

3.1. **Statement of the conjecture.** Let $\varphi \in S_k(N, \omega)$, i.e., φ is a holomorphic cusp form on the upper half plane, for $\Gamma_0(N)$, of weight k and nebentypus character ω. Let $\varphi(z) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n q^n$ be the Fourier expansion of φ at infinity. We let $L(s, \varphi)$ stand for the completed L-function associated to φ and let $L_f(s, \varphi)$ stand for its finite part. Assume that φ is a primitive form in $S_k(N, \omega)$. By primitive, we mean that it is an eigenform, a newform and is normalized such that $a_1(\varphi) = 1$. For $\mathrm{Re}(s) \gg 0$, the finite part $L_f(s, \varphi)$ is a Dirichlet series with an Euler product as

$$L_f(s, \varphi) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n n^{-s} = \prod_p L_p(s, \varphi)$$

where, for all primes p, we have

$$L_p(s, \varphi) = (1 - a_p p^{-s} + \omega(p) p^{k-1-2s})^{-1} = (1 - \alpha_{p,\varphi} p^{-s})^{-1}(1 - \beta_{p,\varphi} p^{-s})^{-1}$$

with the convention that if $p|N$ then $\beta_{p,\varphi} = 0$. We let $\mathrm{Supp}(N)$ stand for the set of primes dividing N and let $S = \mathrm{Supp}(N) \cup \{\infty\}$.

For any $n \geq 1$, the partial n-th symmetric power L-function is defined as

$$L^S(s, \mathrm{Sym}^n\varphi) = \prod_{p \notin S} L_p(s, \mathrm{Sym}^n\varphi), \quad \mathrm{Re}(s) \gg 0,$$

where, for all $p \notin S$, we have

$$L_p(s, \mathrm{Sym}^n\varphi) = \prod_{i=0}^{n}(1 - \alpha_{p,\varphi}^{i}\beta_{p,\varphi}^{n-i}p^{-s})^{-1}.$$

The Langlands program predicts that $L^S(s, \mathrm{Sym}^n\varphi)$, which is intially defined only in a half plane, admits a meromorphic continuation to the entire complex plane and that it has all the usual properties an automorphic L-function is supposed to have. This is known for $n \leq 9$ (with only partial results for $n \geq 5$) from the works of several people including Hecke, Shimura, Jacquet–Langlands, Gelbart–Jacquet, Kim and Shahidi. It is also known for all n for cusp forms of a special type, for instance, if the representation corresponding to the cusp form is dihedral or the other polyhedral types.

For φ a primitive form in $S_k(N, \omega)$, we let $M(\varphi)$ be the motive associated to φ. This is a rank two motive over $\mathbb{Q}$ with coefficients in the field $\mathbb{Q}(\varphi)$ generated by the Fourier coefficients of φ. (We refer the reader to Deligne [8] and Scholl [32] for details about $M(\varphi)$.) The L-function $L(s, M(\varphi))$ associated to this motive is $L(s, \varphi)$. Given the motive $M(\varphi)$, there are nonzero complex numbers, called Deligne's periods, $c^{\pm}(M(\varphi))$ associated to it. Similarly, for the symmetric powers $\mathrm{Sym}^n(M(\varphi))$, we have the corresponding periods $c^{\pm}(\mathrm{Sym}^n(M(\varphi)))$. In [8, Proposition 7.7] the periods for the symmetric powers are related to the periods of $M(\varphi)$. The explicit formulae therein have a quantity $\delta(M(\varphi))$, which depends on the Gauss sum of the nebentypus character ω and the weight k, and is given by

$$\delta(M(\varphi)) \sim (2\pi i)^{1-k}\gamma(\omega) := (2\pi i)^{1-k}\sum_{u=0}^{c-1}\omega(u)\mathrm{exp}(-2\pi i u/c),$$

where c is the conductor of ω, and by $\sim$ we mean up to an element of $\mathbb{Q}(\varphi)$. We will denote the right hand side by $\delta(\omega)$. For brevity, we will denote $c^{\pm}(\mathrm{Sym}^n(M(\varphi)))$ by $c^{\pm}(\mathrm{Sym}^n(\varphi))$, and if $n = 1$ this will be denoted $c^{\pm}(\varphi)$.

Recall [8, Definition 1.3] that an integer m is *critical* for any motivic L-function $L(s, M)$ if both $L_\infty(s, M)$ and $L_\infty(1-s, M^\vee)$ are regular at $s = m$. Recall also that given a φ as above, and given any $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{C})$, the function $\varphi^\sigma(z) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\sigma(a_n)e^{2\pi i n z}$ is a primitive modular form in $S_k(N, \omega^\sigma)$. With this notation, we now state Deligne's conjecture [8, Section 7] on the special values of the symmetric power L-functions.

Conjecture 3.1.1. *Let φ be a primitive form in $S_k(N, \omega)$. There exist nonzero complex numbers $c^{\pm}(\varphi)$ such that*

(1) *for* $n = 2r+1$, *if we denote* $d^{\pm} = r+1$, *and*

$$c^{\pm}(\mathrm{Sym}^n\varphi) = c^{\pm}(\varphi)^{(r+1)(r+2)/2}\, c^{\mp}(\varphi)^{r(r+1)/2}\, \delta(\omega)^{r(r+1)/2};$$

(2) *for* $n = 2r$, *if we denote* $d^{+} = r+1$, $d^{-} = r$,

$$\begin{aligned} c^{+}(\mathrm{Sym}^n\varphi) &= (c^{+}(\varphi)c^{-}(\varphi))^{r(r+1)/2}\, \delta(\omega)^{r(r+1)/2}, \quad \text{and} \\ c^{-}(\mathrm{Sym}^n\varphi) &= (c^{+}(\varphi)c^{-}(\varphi))^{r(r+1)/2}\, \delta(\omega)^{r(r-1)/2}; \end{aligned}$$

then for all $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{C})$ *and for any integer* m *which is critical for* $L_f(s, \mathrm{Sym}^n\varphi)$ *we have*

$$\sigma\left(\frac{L_f(m, \mathrm{Sym}^n\varphi)}{(2\pi i)^{md^{\pm}}\, c^{\pm}(\mathrm{Sym}^n\varphi)}\right) = \frac{L_f(m, \mathrm{Sym}^n\varphi^{\sigma})}{(2\pi i)^{md^{\pm}}\, c^{\pm}(\mathrm{Sym}^n\varphi^{\sigma})}$$

where $\pm = (-1)^m$.

We wish to emphasize that in the original conjecture of Deligne, the numbers $c^{\pm}$ are *periods* which come via a comparison of rational structures on the de Rham and Betti realization of the motive; however, in this paper they are just a couple of complex numbers in terms of which the critical values of the symmetric power L-functions can be expressed.

For $n \leq 3$ the conjecture is known. For $n = 1$ it is due to Shimura [35]; for $n = 2$ it is due to Sturm [36], [37]; for $n = 3$ it is due to Garrett–Harris [9] and Kim–Shahidi [15]. In general the conjecture is not known for higher ($n \geq 4$) symmetric power L-functions. Although, if φ is dihedral, then the conjecture is known to be true for any symmetric power via motivic techniques. This is because Deligne's main conjecture [8, §1 and §2] is known if one considers only the motives as those attached to abelian varieties and the category used is that defined by using absolute Hodge cycles for morphisms. However, in §3.4 we give a proof in the dihedral case using only L-functions.

We remark that a prelude to this conjecture was certain calculations made by Zagier [40] wherein he showed that such a statement holds for the n-th symmetric power L-function, with $n \leq 4$, of the Ramanujan Δ-function.

3.2. **Some known results on special values of L-functions.** The purpose of this subsection is to recall some known special values results which will be relevant to us. Our aim in §3.4 is to prove a special values theorem for $L_f(m, \mathrm{Sym}^n\varphi)$ when φ is dihedral, in which case this L-function factorizes into a product of L-functions of degrees at most two; see Corollary 3.4.3. The following theorems describe the special values of these L-functions. In the course of the proof, we will need to use the special values of symmetric squared L-functions, which is also recalled in this subsection.

Theorem 3.2.1 (Dirichlet L-functions)**.** *Let* χ *be a nontrivial, primitive Dirichlet character modulo* N. *Let* $L_f(\chi, s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \chi(n)/n^s$ *be the usual Dirichlet* L*-series* *associated to* χ. *Let* $\nu \in \{0,1\}$ *be defined by* $\chi(-1) = (-1)^\nu$. *For any integer* $m \geq 1$, *with* $m \equiv \nu \pmod 2$, *we have*

$$L_f(m,\chi) = (-1)^{1+(m-\nu)/2}\frac{\gamma(\chi)}{2i^\nu}\left(\frac{2\pi}{N}\right)^m \frac{B_{m,\overline{\chi}}}{m!}.$$

In the above theorem, a proof of which may be found in [27, §VII.9], the quantity $B_{m,\chi}$ is a generalized Bernoulli number which lies in $\mathbb{Q}(\chi)$–the field generated by the values of χ–and is $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{C})$-equivariant. For our purposes we rephrase the above theorem as

$$\sigma\left(\frac{L_f(m,\chi)}{(2\pi i)^m\gamma(\chi)}\right) = \frac{L_f(m,\chi^\sigma)}{(2\pi i)^m\gamma(\chi^\sigma)}. \tag{3.2.2}$$

Even if χ is not primitive, the above equation still holds. Suppose that χ is a character modulo N and of conductor c, with χ_0 the associated primitive character modulo c. Then, by definition, we have $\gamma(\chi) = \gamma(\chi_0)$, and moreover, if S is the (possibly empty) set of primes p which divides N but not c, then we have the equality

$$L_f(s,\omega) = L_f(s,\omega_0)\prod_{p\in S}(1-\omega_0(p)p^{-s})$$

in a half plane and hence everywhere. It is now easy to see that (3.2.2) holds for such a possibly imprimitive χ.

Theorem 3.2.3 (Modular forms; Shimura [34], [35]). *Let* φ *be a primitive cusp form in* $S_k(N,\omega)$ *with Fourier expansion* $\sum_{n=1}^\infty a_n q^n$ *where* $q = e^{2\pi i z}$. *Let* $\mathbb{Q}(\varphi)$ *be the field generated over* $\mathbb{Q}$ *by the Fourier coefficients of* φ. *Let* ξ *be a Dirichlet character and let* $L_f(s,\varphi,\xi) = \sum_{n=1}^\infty \xi(n)a_n n^{-s}$. *Let* m *be an integer with* $1 \leq m \leq k-1$. *There exists complex numbers* $u^\pm(\varphi)$ *depending only on* φ *such that*

1. *For all* $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{C})$ *we have*
$$\sigma\left(\frac{L_f(m,\varphi,\xi)}{(2\pi i)^m\,\gamma(\xi)\,u^\pm(\varphi)}\right) = \frac{L_f(m,\varphi^\sigma,\xi^\sigma)}{(2\pi i)^m\,\gamma(\xi^\sigma)\,u^\pm(\varphi^\sigma)}$$
where $\pm = (-1)^m\xi(-1)$.
2. *Let* $\langle\varphi,\varphi\rangle$ *be the Petersson inner product defined as in* [34, (2.1)]. *For all* $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{C})$ *we have*
$$\sigma\left(\frac{i^{1-k}\pi\gamma(\omega)\langle\varphi,\varphi\rangle}{u^+(\varphi)u^-(\varphi)}\right) = \frac{i^{1-k}\pi\gamma(\omega^\sigma)\langle\varphi^\sigma,\varphi^\sigma\rangle}{u^+(\varphi^\sigma)u^-(\varphi^\sigma)}.$$

Some remarks are in order, especially about the Shimura's periods $u^\pm(\varphi)$ and their relation to Deligne's periods $c^\pm(\varphi)$ of §3.1. If $k \geq 3$, then Shimura's periods are defined as

$$u^+(\varphi) = \frac{L_f(k-1,\varphi,\xi^+)}{(2\pi i)^{k-1}\,\gamma(\xi^+)},\quad u^-(\varphi) = \frac{L_f(k-1,\varphi,\xi^-)}{(2\pi i)^{k-1}\,\gamma(\xi^-)}$$

where $\xi^{\pm}$ are fixed real valued characters such that $\xi^{+}(-1) = (-1)^{k-1}$ and $\xi^{-}(-1) = (-1)^{k}$. For $k = 2$, Shimura's periods are defined in the proof of, and the remark following, [35, Theorem 2]. It follows from the theorem above and Deligne's conjecture that Shimura's periods $u^{\pm}(\varphi)$ may be identified, up to elements of $\mathbb{Q}(\varphi)$, with Deligne's periods $c^{\pm}(\varphi)$.

Theorem 3.2.4 (Symmetric squared; Sturm [36], [37])**.** *Let φ be a primitive form in $S_k(N, \omega)$. Let $\varphi(z) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n q^n$ be its Fourier expansion. Let ξ be a Dirichlet character. The Euler product*

$$L_f(s, \mathrm{Sym}^2\varphi, \xi) = \prod_p \prod_{i=0}^{2} (1 - \alpha_{p,\varphi}^{i} \beta_{p,\varphi}^{2-i} \xi(p) p^{-s})^{-1}$$

converges for $\mathrm{Re}(s) \gg 0$*, has a meromorphic continuation and has at most two simple poles at $s = k$ and $s = k - 1$. Let $\nu \in \{0, 1\}$ be defined by $\xi(-1) = (-1)^{\nu}$. Let*

$$Z(s, \mathrm{Sym}^2\varphi, \xi) = \frac{L_f(s, \mathrm{Sym}^2\varphi, \xi)\pi^{k-2m-2}}{\langle \varphi, \varphi \rangle \gamma(\theta^2)}$$

where $\theta(a) = \omega(a)\xi(a)\left(\frac{-1}{a}\right)^{k+\nu}$ and $\gamma(\theta^2)$ is the Gauss sum associated to θ^2. For every $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{C})$, and any integer m with $k \leq m \leq 2k - 2 - \nu$ and $m \equiv \nu \pmod 2$, we have

$$Z(m, \mathrm{Sym}^2\varphi, \xi)^{\sigma} = Z(m, \mathrm{Sym}^2\varphi^{\sigma}, \xi^{\sigma}).$$

Sturm proves this result in [37] for $m = k$ and for the rest of the values of m it has been known from his earlier paper [36]. In [37] there is a typo and the exponent of π is incorrectly written as $2m + 1 - k$, the correct one, which is $2m + 2 - k$ may be found in his earlier paper [36]. (Incidentally, there is an amusing typo of a different nature in [36]; see page 221 therein.) Using (2) of Theorem 3.2.3, and Lemma 3.3.6 below, we can rewrite Sturm's theorem as

$$\sigma\left(\frac{L_f(m, \mathrm{Sym}^2\varphi, \xi)}{(2\pi i)^{2m+1-k}(u^{+}(\varphi)u^{-}(\varphi))\gamma(\omega\xi^2)}\right) = \left(\frac{L_f(m, \mathrm{Sym}^2\varphi^{\sigma}, \xi^{\sigma})}{(2\pi i)^{2m+1-k}(u^{+}(\varphi^{\sigma})u^{-}(\varphi^{\sigma}))\gamma((\omega\xi^2)^{\sigma})}\right). \tag{3.2.5}$$

Observe that if ξ is trivial, then using Lemma 3.3.6, the above equation exactly says that Conjecture 3.1.1 is true for $n = 2$.

3.3. **Some lemmas.** The purpose of this subsection is to record the critical integers of a symmetric power L-function associated to a modular form, as well as to record some useful lemmas which will be needed later in the paper.

We let $W_{\mathbb{R}}$ be the Weil group of $\mathbb{R}$. Recall that as a set it is defined as $W_{\mathbb{R}} = \mathbb{C}^* \cup j\mathbb{C}^*$. The group structure is induced from that of $\mathbb{C}^*$ and the relations $jzj^{-1} = \overline{z}$ and $j^2 = -1$. We have a homomorphism $W_{\mathbb{R}} \to \mathbb{R}^*$ which sends $z \in \mathbb{C}^*$ to $|z|$ and sends j to -1. This homomorphism induces an isomorphism from the abelianization $W_{\mathbb{R}}^{\mathrm{ab}} \to \mathbb{R}^*$. We will let $\epsilon : W_{\mathbb{R}} \to \{\pm 1\}$ denote the sign homomorphism, defined as $\epsilon(z) = 1$ and $\epsilon(j) = -1$. For these and other details on $W_{\mathbb{R}}$ we refer the reader to [18]. We let $\mathbb{1}$ denote the trivial representation of the group in context.

Let $k \geq 1$ be an integer. We let χ_{k-1} denote the character of $\mathbb{C}^*$ given by $z \mapsto (z/|z|)^{k-1}$. Let $I(\chi_{k-1})$ denote the representation

$$I(\chi_{k-1}) = \mathrm{Ind}_{\mathbb{C}^*}^{W_{\mathbb{R}}}(\chi_{k-1}).$$

This is the Langlands parameter of the representation at infinity of a weight k modular form. Observe that $I(\chi_{k-1})$ is irreducible if $k \geq 2$.

Lemma 3.3.1. *Let k be an integer ≥ 2. For any $n \geq 1$ we have*

(1) *If $n = 2r+1$ then*

$$\mathrm{Sym}^n(I(\chi_{k-1})) = \bigoplus_{a=0}^{r} I(\chi_{(2a+1)(k-1)}).$$

(2) *If $n = 2r$ then*

$$\mathrm{Sym}^n(I(\chi_{k-1})) = \epsilon^{r(k-1)} \oplus \bigoplus_{a=1}^{r} I(\chi_{(2a(k-1))}).$$

Proof. The proof is quite easy and anyway such lemmas are well known to experts. We sketch the details here for lack of a good reference. We begin by making the following observations. Let $\sigma = I(\chi_{(k-1)})$. The determinant of σ is given by $\det(\sigma) = \epsilon^k$. For any two integers a, b, $I(\chi_a) \otimes I(\chi_b) \simeq I(\chi_{a+b}) \oplus I(\chi_{a-b})$ and $\epsilon \otimes I(\chi_a) \simeq I(\chi_a)$. Finally, $I(\mathbb{1}) = \mathbb{1} \oplus \epsilon$. For any two dimensional representation σ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma \otimes \sigma &\simeq \mathrm{Sym}^2(\sigma) \oplus \det(\sigma), \\ \mathrm{Sym}^2(\sigma) \otimes \sigma &\simeq \mathrm{Sym}^3(\sigma) \oplus (\sigma \otimes \det(\sigma)). \end{aligned}$$

This proves the cases $n = 2, 3$. For any n, observe that

$$\mathrm{Sym}^n(\sigma) \otimes \sigma \simeq \mathrm{Sym}^{n+1}(\sigma) \oplus \mathrm{Sym}^{n-1}(\sigma) \otimes \det(\sigma).$$

The proof follows by induction on n. □

Lemma 3.3.2 (Archimedean local factors [18])**.** *Let σ be an irreducible representation of $W_{\mathbb{R}}$. The local factor $L(s, \sigma)$ is given by the following formulae:*

$$L(s,\sigma) = \begin{cases} \pi^{-(s+t)/2}\,\Gamma\left(\frac{s+t}{2}\right) & \text{, if } \sigma = |\cdot|_{\mathbb{R}}^{t} \\ \pi^{-(s+t+1)/2}\,\Gamma\left(\frac{s+t+1}{2}\right) & \text{, if } \sigma = \epsilon \otimes |\cdot|_{\mathbb{R}}^{t} \\ 2(2\pi)^{-(s+t+l/2)}\ \Gamma(s+t+l/2) & \text{, if } \sigma = I(\chi_l) \otimes |\cdot|_{\mathbb{R}}^{t} \text{ with } l \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

Lemma 3.3.3. *Let $\varphi \in S_k(N, \omega)$ be a primitive form and let $\pi(\varphi)$ be the associated cuspidal automorphic representation. Let $n \geq 1$ be an integer. We have the following equality of L-functions:*

$$L(s, \mathrm{Sym}^n, \pi(\varphi)) = L(s + n(k-1)/2, \mathrm{Sym}^n \varphi).$$

The left hand side is the L-function attached by Langlands to $\pi(\varphi)$ corresponding to the n-th symmetric power of the standard representation of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{C})$.

Proof. We have

$$L_f(s,\varphi) = \prod_p L_p(s,\varphi) = (1-\alpha_{p,\varphi}p^{-s})^{-1}(1-\beta_{p,\varphi}p^{-s})^{-1}.$$

Similarly, we have the L-function of $\pi = \pi(\varphi) = \otimes'_{p\leq\infty}\pi_p$ given by

$$L_f(s,\pi) = \prod_p L_p(s,\pi_p) = \prod_p (1-\alpha_{p,\pi}p^{-s})^{-1}(1-\beta_{p,\pi}p^{-s})^{-1}.$$

We know that $L_f(s,\pi) = L_f(s+(k-1)/2,\varphi)$. (See [10, Example 6.19] for instance.) Hence $\alpha_{p,\pi} = \alpha_{p,\varphi}p^{-(k-1)/2}$ and $\beta_{p,\pi} = \beta_{p,\varphi}p^{-(k-1)/2}$. The lemma follows from the Euler products for both the symmetric power L-functions. □

We can now record the critical integers for symmetric power L-functions. The main ingredients of the proof involves the local Langlands correspondence at infinity and some of the lemmas above. An artifice one keeps in mind is that for an L-function of an automorphic representation of GL_n, we look for critical points m which are integral, if n is odd, and are half-integral of the form $m+1/2$, if n is even. This artifice corresponds to the so-called *motivic normalization* [7, p. 139].

Lemma 3.3.4. *Let φ be a primitive cusp form of weight k. The set of critical integers for $L_f(s,\mathrm{Sym}^{2r+1}\varphi)$ is given by integers m with*

$$r(k-1)+1 \leq m \leq (r+1)(k-1).$$

Proof. See the proof of Lemma 3.3.5 below. □

Lemma 3.3.5. *Let φ be a primitive cusp form of weight k. The set of critical integers for $L_f(s,\mathrm{Sym}^{2r}\varphi)$ is given by:*

(1) *If r odd and k even then*

$$\{(r-1)(k-1)+1, (r-1)(k-1)+3, \dots, r(k-1);\ r(k-1)+1, r(k-1)+3, \dots, (r+1)(k-1)\}.$$

(2) *If r odd and k odd then*

$$\{(r-1)(k-1)+1, (r-1)(k-1)+3, \dots, r(k-1)-1;\ r(k-1)+2, r(k-1)+4, \dots, (r+1)(k-1)\}.$$

(3) *If r even and k even then*

$$\{(r-1)(k-1)+2, (r-1)(k-1)+4, \dots, r(k-1)-1;\ r(k-1)+2, r(k-1)+4, \dots, (r+1)(k-1)-1\}.$$

(4) *If r even and k odd then*

$$\{(r-1)(k-1)+1, (r-1)(k-1)+3, \dots, r(k-1)-1;\ r(k-1)+2, r(k-1)+4, \dots, (r+1)(k-1)\}.$$

Proof. The proof is a rather tedious application of the above lemmas. As a representative example we prove it for $L(s,\mathrm{Sym}^4\varphi)$ and leave the general case to the reader! Let $\pi = \pi(\varphi)$ be the representation associated to φ. We will identify the critical points for $L(s,\mathrm{Sym}^4,\pi)$, and the corresponding statement for $L(s,\mathrm{Sym}^4\phi)$ follows from Lemma 3.3.3. By the above mentioned 'artifice' we look for integers m such that $L_\infty(s,\mathrm{Sym}^4,\pi)$ and $L_\infty(1-s,\mathrm{Sym}^4,\pi^\vee)$ are regular at $s=m$.

Via the local Langlands correspondence we transfer our attention to the L-functions at infinity on the 'Galois side'. Since $\pi = \pi(\varphi)$, the representation π_∞ is a discrete series representation of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ of lowest weight k. The Langlands parameter of this is the representation $I(\chi_{(k-1)}) = \mathrm{Ind}_{\mathbb{C}^*}^{W_\mathbb{R}}(\chi_{k-1})$. Hence

$$L_\infty(s, \mathrm{Sym}^4, \pi) = L(s, \mathrm{Sym}^4(I(\chi_{(k-1)}))).$$

Using Lemma 3.3.1 and Lemma 3.3.2, we get

$$L(s, \mathrm{Sym}^4(I(\chi_{(k-1)}))) \sim \Gamma(s + 2(k-1))\Gamma(s+k-1)\Gamma(s/2).$$

Just for this proof, by $\sim$ we mean up to an exponential function, which is holomorphic and nonvanishing everywhere, and so is irrelevant for the computation of a critical point. We also have

$$L_\infty(1-s, \mathrm{Sym}^4, \pi^\vee) \sim \Gamma(2k-s-1)\Gamma(k-s)\Gamma((1-s)/2).$$

since the Langlands correspondence and symmetric powers both commute with taking contragredients. Hence, we get that an integer m is critical if

(1) $m + k - 1 \geq 1$,
(2) m is not an even nonpositive integer,
(3) $k - m \geq 1$, and
(4) m not an odd positive integer.

□

We end this subsection by recalling some standard facts about Dirichlet characters. We will identify Dirichlet characters with characters of the idèle class group of $\mathbb{Q}$ via the isomorphism [27, Proposition 6.1.10]. An important detail in this dictionary is that the parity of a Dirichlet character χ is seen by the infinity component χ_∞ of the corresponding idèle class character, i.e., $\chi(-1) = \chi_\infty(-1)$. Let φ be a primitive form in $S_k(N, \omega)$, where ω is a Dirichlet character modulo N. Let $\pi(\varphi)$ be the associated cuspidal automorphic representation of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{A}_\mathbb{Q})$. Let $\omega_{\pi(\varphi)}$ be the central character of $\pi(\varphi)$; it is an idèle class character. Under the above identification, we have $\omega_{\pi(\varphi)} = \omega$. This may be seen by comparing the coeffcients of p^{-2s} in the Euler products appearing in the proof of Lemma 3.3.3. We finally recall an important property of the Gauss sum of the product of two Dirichlet characters.

Lemma 3.3.6. *Let ω_1 and ω_2 be Dirichlet characters. For all $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{C})$, we have*

$$\sigma\left(\frac{\gamma(\omega_1)\gamma(\omega_2)}{\gamma(\omega_1\omega_2)}\right) = \frac{\gamma(\omega_1^\sigma)\gamma(\omega_2^\sigma)}{\gamma(\omega_1^\sigma\omega_2^\sigma)}.$$

Proof. This lemma is due to Shimura. See [34, Lemma 8] where the proof is unreasonably complicated. A simpler proof is suggested in [35, (§4, Remark 1)]. For the sake of completeness we sketch this proof. Let c be the least common multiple of the conductors of ω_1, ω_2 and $\omega_1\omega_2$. Let $b \in \mathbb{Z}$ be relatively prime to c such that $\sigma(e^{2\pi i/c}) = e^{2\pi ib/c}$. If c_1 is the conductor of ω_1, then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma(\gamma(\omega_1)) &= \sigma(\sum_{x=0}^{c_1-1}\omega_1(x)e^{2\pi ix/c_1}) = \sum_{x=0}^{c_1-1}\sigma(\omega_1(x))e^{2\pi ibx/c_1} \\ &= \sigma(\omega_1(b)^{-1})\sum_{x=0}^{c_1-1}\omega_1^{\sigma}(x)e^{2\pi ix/c_1} = \sigma(\omega_1(b)^{-1})\gamma(\omega_1^{\sigma}).\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, $\sigma(\gamma(\omega_2)) = \sigma(\omega_2(b)^{-1})\gamma(\omega_2^{\sigma})$ and $\sigma(\gamma(\omega_1\omega_2)) = \sigma(\omega_1(b)^{-1}\omega_2(b)^{-1})\gamma(\omega_1^{\sigma}\omega_2^{\sigma})$. Hence the quotient $\gamma(\omega_1)\gamma(\omega_2)/\gamma(\omega_1\omega_2)$ is equivariant under all $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{C})$. $\square$

3.4. **Dihedral forms.** In this section we prove a theorem about the special values of any symmetric power L-function associated to a dihedral cusp form. This formally looks exactly like Deligne's conjecture, the only *difference* being that Deligne's motivically defined periods $c^{\pm}(\varphi)$ are replaced by Shimura's periods $u^{\pm}(\varphi)$. (See the paragraph after Theorem 3.2.3.) As mentioned earlier, Deligne's conjecture for dihedral forms is known via motivic considerations. In what follows we use only L-functions, and in the process use some nonvanishing results for twists of L-functions. The technical heart of the proof below is a certain *period relation* which is interesting in its own right, and it is this relation which justifies this section. If φ_χ denotes the dihedral modular form corresponding to a character χ of an imaginary quadratic number field, then the main theorem proved in this section relates the periods of φ_{χ^n}–for any power χ^n of χ–to the periods of φ_χ (see Theorem 3.4.7 below).

Note that if one has a cuspidal automorphic representation π of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{Q}})$, and suppose $\pi = \mathrm{AI}_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\chi)$ is dihedral, then every symmetric power lifting $\mathrm{Sym}^n(\pi)$, in the sense of Langlands functoriality, exists. To state functoriality, we need some notation. Let $W'_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ denote the Weil-Deligne group of $\mathbb{Q}_p$. The local Langlands correspondence (see [20]) gives a bijection between irreducible admissible representations π of $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ and n-dimensional semisimple representations σ of $W'_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$. We will denote this bijection by $\pi \mapsto \sigma(\pi)$ and similarly $\sigma \mapsto \pi(\sigma)$. Now let π denote a cuspidal automorphic representation of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{Q}})$. Then π is a tensor product of local representations as $\pi = \otimes'\pi_p$. (We let p run through the finite primes as well as ∞.) To each π_p, a representation of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Q}_p)$, is associated via the local Langlands correspondence, a representation $\pi(\mathrm{Sym}^n(\sigma(\pi_p)))$ of $\mathrm{GL}_{n+1}(\mathbb{Q}_p)$. We will denote this representation as $\mathrm{Sym}^n(\pi_p)$. If π_p is unramified then so is $\mathrm{Sym}^n(\pi_p)$. The global symmetric power lift is defined as $\mathrm{Sym}^n(\pi) = \otimes'_{p\leq\infty}\mathrm{Sym}^n(\pi_p)$. Langlands functoriality takes the form that the irreducible representation $\mathrm{Sym}^n(\pi)$ is an isobaric automorphic representation of $\mathrm{GL}_{n+1}(\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{Q}})$. This functorial formalism also asserts that the symmetric power L-function $L(s, \mathrm{Sym}^n, \pi)$ is the standard L-function $L(s, \mathrm{Sym}^n(\pi))$ of $\mathrm{Sym}^n(\pi)$. If π is dihedral then one can indeed write down the isobaric decomposition of $\mathrm{Sym}^n(\pi)$. See Lemma 3.4.2 below.

For the rest of this section we let $K/\mathbb{Q}$ be an imaginary quadratic extension. We will let $\omega_K = \omega_{K/\mathbb{Q}}$ denote the corresponding quadratic character of $\mathbb{Q}^*\backslash\mathbb{I}_\mathbb{Q}$. (Note that as a Dirichlet character, ω_K is an odd character.) We let γ_K denote the Gauss sum associated to ω_K. We let χ denote a character of $K^*\backslash\mathbb{I}_K$ such that its infinity component is $\chi_\infty(z) = (z/|z|)^{k-1}$ for an integer $k \geq 2$. Hence χ^n is not $\mathrm{Gal}(K/\mathbb{Q})$ invariant for any $n \geq 1$ by the following lemma.

Lemma 3.4.1. *Let φ be a primitive form in $S_k(N, \omega)$. Suppose that $\pi = \pi(\varphi)$ is a dihedral form, $\pi = \mathrm{AI}_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\chi)$, where for some integer $r \geq 1$, χ^r is invariant under the Galois group of $K/\mathbb{Q}$. Then φ is necessarily a weight 1 form, i.e., $k = 1$.*

Proof. Since $\pi = \pi(\varphi) = \mathrm{AI}_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\chi)$ corresponds to a weight k form, we must have the character at infinity $\chi_\infty : K_\infty \to \mathbb{C}^*$, to be given by $\chi_\infty(z) = (z/|z|)^{k-1}$. Since χ^r is Galois invariant, there is an idèle class character μ of $\mathbb{Q}$ such that $\chi^r = \mu \circ N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}$. Let the character $\mu_\infty : \mathbb{Q}_\infty \to \mathbb{C}^*$ be given by $\mu_\infty(a) = \mathrm{sign}(a)^\varepsilon |a|^t$ for $\varepsilon \in \{0, 1\}$ and some $t \in \mathbb{C}$. The relation $\chi_\infty^r = \mu_\infty \circ N_{K_\infty/\mathbb{Q}_\infty}$ gives $(z/|z|)^{r(k-1)} = |z|^{2t}$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}^*$. It is easy to see that this forces $k = 1$ and $t = 0$. □

We note that as far as Deligne's conjectures are concerned, weight 1 forms are not interesting since by Lemma 3.3.4 and Lemma 3.3.5 the symmetric power L-functions do not have critical points. We will henceforth assume that χ^n is not Galois invariant for any nonzero integer n.

Let $\pi = \pi(\chi) := \mathrm{AI}_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\chi)$ be the dihedral cuspidal automorphic representation associated to χ. We denote the corresponding holomorphic cusp form as φ_χ. Note that $\varphi_\chi \in S_k(N, \omega)$ where the level N depends on the conductor of χ and the discriminant of K, and the nebentypus ω can be described as $\omega\omega_K = \chi_\mathbb{Q}$ as an equality of idèle class characters of $\mathbb{Q}$. (Here $\chi_\mathbb{Q}$ denotes the restriction of χ to $\mathbb{I}_\mathbb{Q}$.) The first step to proving Deligne's conjecture is to write down a decomposition of $L(s, \mathrm{Sym}^n\varphi)$ when $\varphi = \varphi_\chi$ is dihedral. The following lemma gives the isobaric decomposition of a symmetric power lift of a dihedral cusp form.

Lemma 3.4.2. *Let χ be a character of a quadratic extension $K/\mathbb{Q}$ and assume that χ^n is not Galois invariant for any nonzero integer n. Recall that $\chi_\mathbb{Q}$ is the restriction of χ to the idèles of $\mathbb{Q}$. Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Sym}^{2r}(\mathrm{AI}_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\chi)) &= \boxplus_{a=0}^{r-1} \mathrm{AI}_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\chi^{2r-a}\chi'^{a}) \boxplus \chi_\mathbb{Q}^r, \\
\mathrm{Sym}^{2r+1}(\mathrm{AI}_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\chi)) &= \boxplus_{a=0}^{r} \mathrm{AI}_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\chi^{2r+1-a}\chi'^{a}).
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. The proof is by induction on n for $\mathrm{Sym}^n(\mathrm{AI}_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\chi))$ and is analogous to the proof of Lemma 3.3.1. We leave the details to the reader. □

Corollary 3.4.3. *The symmetric power L-functions of a dihedral cusp form decompose as follows:*

$$\begin{aligned}
L_f(s, \mathrm{Sym}^{2r}\varphi_\chi) &= L_f(s - r(k-1), (\omega\omega_K)^r) \prod_{a=0}^{r-1} L_f(s - a(k-1), \varphi_{\chi^{2(r-a)}}, \omega^a) \\
&= L_f(s - r(k-1), (\omega\omega_K)^r) \prod_{a=0}^{r-1} L_f(s - a(k-1), \varphi_{\chi^{2(r-a)}}, (\omega\omega_K)^a). \\
L_f(s, \mathrm{Sym}^{2r+1}\varphi_\chi) &= \prod_{a=0}^{r} L_f(s - a(k-1), \varphi_{\chi^{2(r-a)+1}}, \omega^a) \\
&= \prod_{a=0}^{r} L_f(s - a(k-1), \varphi_{\chi^{2(r-a)+1}}, (\omega\omega_K)^a).
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Note that $\mathrm{AI}_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\chi^{2r-a}\chi'^a) \simeq \mathrm{AI}_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\chi^{2(r-a)}) \otimes \chi_{\mathbb{Q}}^a$ and a similar statement for odd symmetric powers. Note also that for any integer l, $\mathrm{AI}_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\chi^l) \simeq \mathrm{AI}_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\chi^l) \otimes \omega_K$. The proof follows from Lemma 3.3.3 and Lemma 3.4.2. □

To prove Deligne's conjecture for dihedral forms, we will need to relate the periods of the cusp forms φ_{χ^n} to the periods of the cusp form φ_χ, but before doing so we need some preliminaries on Galois properties of dihedral forms. Especially, we want to know the behaviour of dihedral forms under the action of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{C})$.

Given a primitive modular form φ of weight k, with Fourier expansion $\varphi(z) = \sum a_n e^{2\pi i n z}$, and given $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{C})$, we define $\varphi^\sigma(z) = \sum \sigma(a_n) e^{2\pi i n z}$, which is also a primitive modular form of the same weight k. We begin by observing that the process of attaching a cuspidal representation $\pi(\varphi)$ to φ is not an equivariant process in general. It is so exactly when the weight k is even, which is also the parity condition on k which ensures that $\pi(\varphi)$ is algebraic. It is easily checked that $\pi(\varphi) \otimes \| \|^{-k/2}$ is an algebraic (regular cuspidal automorphic) representation. (See Clozel [7, p.91].) Appealing to [7, Théorème 3.13] we deduce that $(\pi(\varphi) \otimes \| \|^{-k/2})^\sigma$ is an algebraic cuspidal representation. Indeed, we have

$$(\pi(\varphi) \otimes \| \|^{-k/2})^\sigma = \pi(\varphi^\sigma) \otimes \| \|^{-k/2}. \tag{3.4.4}$$

This may be seen by comparing both sides at all unramified places, while using Waldspurger [39, Exemple §I.2]. (It is interesting to note that, in the spirit of Clozel [7, Definitions 1.9–1.11], one can define the process $\varphi \mapsto \pi(\varphi)$, with a Tate twist $\pi^T(\varphi) := \pi(\varphi) \otimes \| \|^{-k/2}$, so that the map $\varphi \mapsto \pi^T(\varphi)$ is equivariant, i.e., respects algebraicity.)

Next, we analyze such an equivariance property for automorphic induction. Let χ be a Hecke character of K (an imaginary quadratic extension) with $\chi_\infty(z) = (z/|z|)^{k-1}$ for an integer $k \geq 2$. Consider the automorphic induction $\mathrm{AI}_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\chi)$, which is a cuspidal representation. As above, $\mathrm{AI}_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\chi) \otimes \| \|^{-k/2}$ is an algebraic representation. We can apply σ to this, and ask for the relation of the resulting representation with the induction of χ^σ. Note that χ is not algebraic in general, however, $\chi \otimes \| \ \|^{-(k-1)/2}$ is an algebraic idèle class character, and so we can apply σ to such a twist of χ. (For the definition of $(\chi \otimes \| \ \|^{-(k-1)/2})^\sigma$ see Clozel [7, p.107].) We have

$$(\mathrm{AI}_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\chi) \otimes \| \ \|^{-k/2})^\sigma = \mathrm{AI}_{K/\mathbb{Q}}((\chi \otimes \| \ \|^{-(k-1)/2})^\sigma) \otimes \| \ \|^{-1/2}. \tag{3.4.5}$$

To such a character χ we have the modular cusp form φ_χ, which we recall is defined as that form for which $\pi(\varphi_\chi) = \mathrm{AI}_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\chi)$. From (3.4.4) and (3.4.5) we deduce

$$\varphi_\chi^\sigma = \varphi_{(\chi \otimes \| \ \|^{-(k-1)/2})^\sigma \otimes \| \ \|^{(k-1)/2}}. \tag{3.4.6}$$

In particular, if φ is a dihedral form then so is φ^σ, and comes from the same quadratic extension (namely K) as that for φ.

(If k is odd, then (3.4.6) simplifies to $\varphi_\chi^\sigma = \varphi_{\chi^\sigma}$. This can be seen easily in the classical setup: We let $\tilde{\chi}$ be the corresponding Grössencharakter attached to χ. Define a function $\varphi_{\tilde{\chi}}$ on the upper half plane by

$$\varphi_{\tilde{\chi}}(z) = \sum_{\mathfrak{a}} \tilde{\chi}(\mathfrak{a}) N(\mathfrak{a})^{(k-1)/2} e^{2\pi i N(\mathfrak{a}) z}$$

where $\mathfrak{a}$ runs over all the integral ideals of K. Assume that χ (or equivalently $\tilde{\chi}$) is primitive. Then $\varphi_{\tilde{\chi}}$ is a primitive modular cusp form. (See [25, Theorem 3.8.2].) Then $\varphi_\chi = \varphi_{\tilde{\chi}}$ which may be seen by comparing Satake parameters for both the modular forms. Now the equivariance of $\chi \mapsto \varphi_\chi$ is obvious when k is odd.)

We can now state and prove the main result of this section.

Theorem 3.4.7 (Period relations for dihedral forms)**.** *Let χ be a Hecke character of an imaginary quadratic field K with $\chi_\infty(z) = (z/|z|)^{k-1}$ for an integer $k \geq 2$. Let φ_χ be the corresponding modular cusp form. For any positive integer n and for all $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{C})$ we have*

(1)
$$\sigma\left(\frac{u^+(\varphi_{\chi^n})}{u^+(\varphi_\chi)^n}\right) = \frac{u^+(\varphi_{\chi^n}^\sigma)}{u^+(\varphi_\chi^\sigma)^n}$$

(2)
$$\sigma\left(\frac{u^-(\varphi_{\chi^n})}{u^+(\varphi_\chi)^n \gamma_K}\right) = \frac{u^-(\varphi_{\chi^n}^\sigma)}{u^+(\varphi_\chi^\sigma)^n \gamma_K}$$

where γ_K is the Gauss sum of the quadratic character ω_K of $\mathbb{Q}$ associated to K.

Proof. Before we get into the proof of the theorem, we record some nonvanishing results for L-functions which will be useful later on.

Lemma 3.4.8. *With the notations as above*

1. *There is an even Dirichlet character ξ such that $L_f(1, \varphi_\chi, \xi) \neq 0$.*
2. *There is an even Dirichlet character ξ such that $L_f(k, \varphi_{\chi^n} \times (\varphi_\chi \otimes \xi)) \neq 0$.*

Proof. The first assertion follows by using the main theorem of Rohrlich [31]. The second assertion follows by using the main theorem of Barthel–Ramakrishnan [1] while thinking of the Rankin–Selberg L-function as a standard L-function for GL_4, which we can do by the work of Ramakrishnan [30]. ☐

We will prove the theorem by induction on n. The following lemma is the $n = 1$ case of the theorem, for which (1) is a tautology, and it is only statement (2) which needs a proof. Observe that (2) implies in particular that for any dihedral form the periods $u^{\pm}$ are algebraically dependent. (See also Harris [13, Remark (2.7)] and Bertrand [2, Corollary 1, p.35].)

Lemma 3.4.9. *With the notations as in Theorem 3.4.7 we have*

$$\sigma\left(\frac{u^{\pm}(\varphi_\chi)}{u^{\mp}(\varphi_\chi)\gamma_K}\right) = \frac{u^{\pm}(\varphi_\chi^\sigma)}{u^{\mp}(\varphi_\chi^\sigma)\gamma_K}.$$

Proof. By Lemma 3.4.8 there is an even Dirichlet character ξ such that $L(1, \varphi_\chi, \xi) \neq 0$. Since $\mathrm{AI}_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\chi) \simeq \mathrm{AI}_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\chi) \otimes \omega_K$ we get $L_f(s, \varphi_\chi, \eta) = L_f(s, \varphi_\chi, \eta\omega_K)$ for any Dirichlet character η. We have

$$\frac{u^+(\varphi_\chi)\gamma_K}{u^-(\varphi_\chi)} = \left(\frac{(2\pi i)u^+(\varphi_\chi)\gamma(\xi\omega_K)}{L(1, \varphi_\chi, \xi\omega_K)}\right)\left(\frac{L(1, \varphi_\chi, \xi)}{(2\pi i)u^-(\varphi_\chi)\gamma(\xi)}\right)\left(\frac{\gamma(\xi)\gamma(\omega_K)}{\gamma(\xi\omega_K)}\right).$$

By Theorem 3.2.3 and Lemma 3.3.6 every factor on the right is $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{C})$-equivariant, and hence so is the left hand side. Observe also that

$$\frac{u^+(\varphi_\chi)}{u^-(\varphi_\chi)\gamma_K} = \left(\frac{u^+(\varphi_\chi)\gamma_K}{u^-(\varphi_\chi)}\right)\gamma_K^{-2}.$$

This proves the lemma since $\gamma_K^2 \in \mathbb{Q}$. ☐

The above lemma applied to χ^n gives (1) ⇒ (2) of Theorem 3.4.7 since

$$\frac{u^-(\varphi_{\chi^n})}{u^+(\varphi_\chi)^n\gamma_K} = \left(\frac{u^-(\varphi_{\chi^n})}{u^+(\varphi_{\chi^n})\gamma_K}\right)\left(\frac{u^+(\varphi_{\chi^n})}{u^+(\varphi_\chi)^n}\right).$$

It remains to prove (1), which we do so by induction on n. We just verified the $n = 1$ case in the above lemma. Next, we prove it for $n = 2$, and then prove it by induction for all n (since the statement for $n+1$ will depend on the statements for n and $n-1$). Applying Corollary 3.4.3 we have

$$L_f(2k-2, \varphi_{\chi^2})L_f(k-1, \omega\omega_K) = L_f(2k-2, \mathrm{Sym}^2\varphi_\chi).$$

Observe that $(\omega\omega_K)(-1) = (-1)^{k+1}$ and hence $2k-2$ is critical for $L_f(s, \mathrm{Sym}^2\varphi_\chi)$ by Theorem 3.2.4 or by Lemma 3.3.5, and (necessarily) $k-1$ is critical for $L_f(s, \omega\omega_{K/\mathbb{Q}})$ and $2k-2$ is critical for $L_f(s, \varphi_{\chi^2})$. Observe also that since $k \geq 2$ both the factors on the left hand side are nonzero. Finally, in the expression

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{u^+(\varphi_{\chi^2})}{u^+(\varphi_\chi)^2} \; = \; & \left(\frac{(2\pi i)^{2k-2}u^+(\varphi_{\chi^2})}{L_f(2k-2, \varphi_{\chi^2})}\right) \cdot \left(\frac{L_f(2k-2, \mathrm{Sym}^2\varphi_\chi)}{(2\pi i)^{3k-3}u^+(\varphi_\chi)u^-(\varphi_\chi)\gamma(\omega)}\right) \cdot \\ & \left(\frac{(2\pi i)^{k-1}\gamma(\omega\omega_K)}{L_f(k-1, \omega\omega_K)}\right) \cdot \left(\frac{\gamma(\omega)\gamma(\omega_K)}{\gamma(\omega\omega_K)}\right) \cdot \left(\frac{u^-(\varphi_\chi)}{u^+(\varphi_\chi)\gamma_K}\right)\end{aligned}$$

applying Theorem 3.2.3, Theorem 3.2.4, (3.2.2), Lemma 3.3.6, and Lemma 3.4.9, we see that each of the five factors on the right is $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{C})$-equivariant, and hence so is the left hand side. To apply induction for $n \geq 3$, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 3.4.10. *For all $n \geq 2$ we have*

$$\sigma\left(\frac{u^+(\varphi_{\chi^{n+1}})u^-(\varphi_{\chi^{n-1}})}{u^+(\varphi_{\chi^n})u^-(\varphi_{\chi^n})}\right) = \frac{u^+(\varphi^\sigma_{\chi^{n+1}})u^-(\varphi^\sigma_{\chi^{n-1}})}{u^+(\varphi^\sigma_{\chi^n})u^-(\varphi^\sigma_{\chi^n})}$$

Proof. Consider the Rankin-Selberg L-function $L(s, \varphi_{\chi^n} \times \varphi_\chi)$. It is easy to see using Lemma 3.3.3 that

$$L_f(s, \varphi_{\chi^n} \times \varphi_\chi) = L_f(s, \varphi_{\chi^{n+1}})L_f(s-k+1, \varphi_{\chi^{n-1}}, \omega). \tag{3.4.11}$$

Note that $s = k$ is critical for $L_f(s, \varphi_{\chi^{n+1}})$ and $L_f(s-k+1, \varphi_{\chi^{n-1}}, \omega)$ and hence it is critical for the Rankin-Selberg L-function also. The lemma *follows* by evaluating (3.4.11) at $s = k$. Applying Lemma 3.4.8 we can choose an even Dirichlet character ξ such that $L_f(k, \varphi_{\chi^n} \times (\varphi_\chi \otimes \xi)) \neq 0$. If $\pm = (-1)^k$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{u^+(\varphi_{\chi^n})u^-(\varphi_{\chi^n})}{u^\pm(\varphi_{\chi^{n+1}})u^\mp(\varphi_{\chi^{n-1}})} \; = \; & \left(\frac{(2\pi i)^{k+1}(u^+(\varphi_{\chi^n})u^-(\varphi_{\chi^n}))\gamma(\omega\xi^2)}{L_f(k, \varphi_{\chi^n} \times (\varphi_\chi \otimes \xi))}\right) \cdot \\ & \left(\frac{L_f(k, \varphi_{\chi^{n+1}}, \xi)}{(2\pi i)^k u^\pm(\varphi_{\chi^{n+1}})\gamma(\xi)}\right) \cdot \left(\frac{L_f(1, \varphi_{\chi^{n-1}}, \omega\xi)}{(2\pi i)u^\mp(\varphi_{\chi^{n-1}})\gamma(\omega\xi)}\right) \cdot \\ & \left(\frac{\gamma(\omega\xi)\gamma(\xi)}{\gamma(\omega\xi^2)}\right).\end{aligned}$$

In the right hand side, we see that the first factor is $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{C})$-equivariant by applying Shimura [35, Theorem 4]. (In the notations of that theorem, take $f = \varphi_{\chi^n}$, and $g = \varphi_\chi \otimes \xi$; observe that all the hypothesis of that theorem are indeed satisfied.) Further, applying Theorem 3.2.3 and Lemma 3.3.6 we see that every factor is equivariant and hence so is the left hand side. If k is even then this exactly proves the lemma, and if k is odd, we still get the lemma by appealing (twice) to Lemma 3.4.9. □

Theorem 3.4.7 follows by induction using Lemma 3.4.10 (and Lemma 3.4.9). □

We are now in a position to verify Deligne's conjecture for a dihedral cusp form.

Theorem 3.4.12. *For a dihedral cusp form (like φ_χ) Conjecture 3.1.1 is true.*

Proof. The proof follows from Corollary 3.4.3, Lemma 3.3.4, Lemma 3.3.5, Theorem 3.4.7 and Theorem 3.2.3. While using Corollary 3.4.3 it is convenient to use the decompositions with ω^a if k is even and to use those with $(\omega\omega_K)^a$ if k is odd, since the special values of a twisted L-function are easy to describe if the twisting character is even. Carrying out the proof is rather tedious; we just sketch the details in one case, the rest of the cases being absolutely similar.

Consider $L_f(m, \mathrm{Sym}^{2r+1}\varphi_\chi)$. Checking the details will depend on the parities of m, r and k; eight cases in all. We sketch the details when all of them are even. From Corollary 3.4.3 we have

$$L_f(m, \mathrm{Sym}^{2r+1}\varphi_\chi) = \prod_{a=0}^{r} L_f(m - a(k-1), \varphi_{\chi^{2(r-a)+1}}, \omega^a)$$

where m is given by Lemma 3.3.4. Applying Theorem 3.2.3 to every factor on the right we get that

$$\prod_{a=0}^{r} \frac{L_f(m - a(k-1), \varphi_{\chi^{2(r-a)+1}}, \omega^a)}{(2\pi i)^{m-a(k-1)} u^{(-1)^a}(\varphi_{\chi^{2(r-a)+1}})\gamma(\omega^a)}$$

is $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{C})$-equivariant. The denominator, after grouping together the various powers of $(2\pi i)$, the powers of $\gamma(\omega)$ (using Lemma 3.3.6) and finally the periods $u^\pm$, is up to equivariant quantities, the same as

$$(2\pi i)^{m(r+1)-(k-1)r(r+1)/2}\gamma(\omega)^{r(r+1)/2}(u^+(\varphi_{\chi^{2r+1}})u^-(\varphi_{\chi^{2r-1}})\cdots u^-(\varphi_{\chi^3})u^+(\varphi_\chi)).$$

Using Theorem 3.4.7 and the definition of $\delta(\omega)$ this simplifies, up to equivariant quantities, to

$$(2\pi i)^{m(r+1)}\delta(\omega)^{r(r+1)/2}u^+(\varphi_\chi)^{(r+1)^2}\gamma_K^{r/2}.$$

Since r is even, $r/2 \equiv r(r+1)/2 \pmod 2$, and $\gamma_K^2 \in \mathbb{Q}$, using Theorem 3.4.7 this further simplifies to

$$(2\pi i)^{m(r+1)}c^+(\mathrm{Sym}^{2r+1}\varphi_\chi)$$

which concludes the proof in this case. (In the definition of $c^+(\mathrm{Sym}^{2r+1}\varphi_\chi)$, we replace $c^\pm(\varphi_\chi)$ by $u^\pm(\varphi_\chi)$; see the paragraph after Theorem 3.2.3.)

The remaining cases, when at least one of m, r or k is odd, are absolutely similar. Likewise, the case of $L_f(m, \mathrm{Sym}^{2r}\varphi_\chi)$, with its eight subcases depending on the parities of m, r and k, is again very similar. We leave the details to the reader. □

4. Remarks on symmetric fourth power L-functions

4.1. **Consequences of cuspidality of the symmetric fourth.** We recall one of the main theorems of Kim–Shahidi [17] which characterizes cuspidality of the symmetric fourth power transfer of a cusp form on GL_2. The following theorem is equivalent to [17, Theorem 3.3.7].

Theorem 4.1.1. *Let F be a number field and let π be a cuspidal automorphic representation of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{A}_F)$. Then $\mathrm{Sym}^4(\pi)$ is not cuspidal as an automorphic representation of $\mathrm{GL}_5(\mathbb{A}_F)$ if and only if π is dihedral, tetrahedral or octahedral.*

We digress a little and clarify the various equivalent versions of a cuspidal automorphic representation being dihedral, tetrahedral or octahedral type. The proofs are slightly scattered over the literature and the aim is to guide the reader to the appropriate references, while sketching some easy arguments. The expert on these issues can skip to the paragraph after the proof of Proposition 4.1.4.

Proposition 4.1.2. *Let F be a number field and let π be a cuspidal automorphic representation of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{A}_F)$. Then the following are equivalent.*

1. *π is dihedral, i.e., π is attached to a two dimensional irreducible representation σ of W_F which is induced from a character of W_K for a quadratic extension K/F; $\sigma = \mathrm{Ind}_{W_K}^{W_F}(\chi)$.*
2. *There exists a nontrivial idèle class character η of F such that $\pi \simeq \pi \otimes \eta$. The character η is necessarily quadratic.*
3. *$\mathrm{Sym}^2(\pi)$ is not cuspidal.*

Proof. For (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2) take $\eta = \omega_{K/F}$. The statement (2) $\Rightarrow$ (1) is due to Labesse–Langlands [21, Proposition 6.5]. The statement (2) $\Rightarrow$ (3) can be seen using L-functions and the heuristic $\sigma\otimes\sigma^\vee \simeq (\sigma\otimes\eta)\otimes\sigma^\vee \simeq (\mathrm{Sym}^2(\sigma)\otimes\det(\sigma)^{-1}\eta)\oplus\eta$. Hence the L-function $L(s, \mathrm{Sym}^2(\pi)\otimes\omega_\pi^{-1}\eta)$ has a pole at $s = 1$. The statement (3) $\Rightarrow$ (2) is contained in Gelbart–Jacquet [11, Theorem 9.3]. ☐

Proposition 4.1.3. *Let F be a number field and let π be a cuspidal automorphic representation of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{A}_F)$. Assume that π is not dihedral. Then the following are equivalent.*

1. *π is tetrahedral, i.e., π is attached to a two dimensional irreducible representation $\sigma : W_F \to \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ whose image in $\mathrm{PGL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ is isomorphic to A_4.*
2. *There exists a nontrivial idèle class character η of F such that $\mathrm{Sym}^2(\pi) \simeq \mathrm{Sym}^2(\pi)\otimes\eta$. The character η is necessarily cubic.*
3. *$\mathrm{Sym}^2(\pi)$ is cuspidal and $\mathrm{Sym}^3(\pi)$ is not cuspidal.*

Proof. The statement (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2) follows from the representation theory of A_4; it suffices to observe that there is a character η such that $\mathrm{Sym}^2(\sigma) \simeq \mathrm{Sym}^2(\sigma)\otimes\eta$.

The statement (2) $\Rightarrow$ (1) can be seen as follows: Let E/F be the cyclic extension of degree 3 defined by η. Since π satisfies $\mathrm{Sym}^2(\sigma) \simeq \mathrm{Sym}^2(\sigma)\otimes\eta$, we get using the first paragraph of the proof of Lemma 9.2 in [33] that the base change π_E of π to E is monomial, i.e., $\pi_E = \pi(\sigma_E)$ for a representation σ_E of W_E which is induced from a quadratic extension K/E as $\sigma_E = \mathrm{Ind}_{W_K}^{W_E}(\chi)$ for some character χ. Since π_E is $\mathrm{Gal}(E/F)$-invariant, so is σ_E. Hence σ_E extends to a representation, say σ of W_F. That it extends may be seen by Lemma 7.9 of [19]; or by appealing to the fact that $H^2(W_F, \mathbb{C}^*)$ is trivial. Consider the image I of σ in $\mathrm{PGL}_2(\mathbb{C})$. It is not cyclic because π is cuspidal; it is not dihedral because π is assumed not to be dihedral; it is not S_4 or A_5 because neither has an index 3 subgroup; hence the image I is A_4 or that σ is tetrahedral type. Now consider $\pi(\sigma)$ and its base change $\pi(\sigma)_E$ to E. We have $\pi(\sigma)_E = \pi(\sigma|_{W_E}) = \pi(\sigma_E) = \pi_E$. Hence for some $i = 0, 1, 2$ we have $\pi = \pi(\sigma) \otimes \eta^i = \pi(\sigma \otimes \eta^i)$.

The equivalence (2) $\Leftrightarrow$ (3) is contained in [16, Proposition 6.3] □

Proposition 4.1.4. *Let F be a number field and let π be a cuspidal automorphic representation of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{A}_F)$. Assume that π is neither dihedral nor tetrahedral. Then the following are equivalent.*

1. *π is octahedral, i.e., π is attached to a two dimensional irreducible representation $\sigma : W_F \to \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ whose image in $\mathrm{PGL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ is isomorphic to S_4.*
2. *There exists a quadratic extension E/F and there exists a nontrivial idèle class character η of E such that $\mathrm{BC}_{E/F}(\mathrm{Sym}^2(\pi)) \simeq \mathrm{BC}_{E/F}(\mathrm{Sym}^2(\pi)) \otimes \eta$. The character η is necessarily cubic.*
3. *$\mathrm{Sym}^2(\pi)$ and $\mathrm{Sym}^3(\pi)$ are cuspidal, and $\mathrm{Sym}^4(\pi)$ is not cuspidal.*

Proof. The statement (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2) follows from Proposition 4.1.3 by noting that A_4 is a normal subgroup of index 2 in S_4 and that $\mathrm{BC}_{E/F}$ commutes with Sym^2 which can be seen by verifying it locally everywhere. The statement (2) $\Rightarrow$ (1) is proved in [17, Proposition 3.3.8 (2)] and is similar to the the proof of (2) $\Rightarrow$ (1) of Proposition 4.1.3 above. The equivalence (2) $\Leftrightarrow$ (3) is contained in [17, Proposition 3.3.6]. □

Now let us consider Deligne's conjecture for the special values of $L(s, \mathrm{Sym}^4\varphi)$ where φ is a primitive form in $S_k(N, \omega)$. The L-function is, up to shifting by $2(k-1)$, the standard L-function $L(s, \mathrm{Sym}^4(\pi(\varphi))$. If the representation $\mathrm{Sym}^4(\pi(\varphi))$ is not cuspidal, then appealing to the above cuspidality theorem we know that $\pi(\varphi)$ is either dihedral, tetrahedral or octahedral. In the dihedral case we have given a proof in §3.4. The proof in the tetrahedral and octahedral cases, if one may use the word proof in such a context, boils down to showing that there are no critical integers for $L(s, \mathrm{Sym}^4, \pi)$ and hence Deligne's conjecture is vacuously true! The following well known lemma says that in these cases the cusp form we begin with is necessarily of weight one ($k = 1$), and so from Lemma 3.3.4 and Lemma 3.3.5 it follows that there are no critical points.

Lemma 4.1.5. *Let φ be a primitive form in $S_k(N, \omega)$. Let $\pi = \pi(\varphi)$ be the cuspidal representation of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{Q}})$ attached to φ. If π corresponds to a two dimensional representation σ of $W_{\mathbb{Q}}$ whose image in $\mathrm{PGL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ is finite, then $k = 1$. (In particular, if $\pi(\varphi)$ is tetrahedral or octahedral, then the modular form φ we begin with is necessarily a weight one form.)*

Proof. If $k \geq 2$, then the image of $\sigma_\infty = \mathrm{Ind}_{\mathbb{C}^*}^{W_{\mathbb{R}}}(\chi_{k-1})$ in $\mathrm{PGL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ is infinite. □

We need to consider the case now when $\mathrm{Sym}^4(\pi(\varphi))$ is cuspidal. A possible strategy then is to appeal to the work of Mahnkopf [24] and apply his results on the special values of standard L-functions of GL_n to the particular case of $L(s, \mathrm{Sym}^4(\pi(\varphi))$. Recall that an important part of the hypothesis in his work is that representation one begins with is cohomological. Since this is of independent interest, we consider this in the next subsection.

4.2. **Cohomological criterion.** In this subsection we recall the following theorem, essentially due to Labesse-Schwermer [22], which says that symmetric power lifts of a holomorphic modular form are cohomological.

Theorem 4.2.1. *Let* $\varphi \in S_k(N, \omega)$ *with* $k \geq 2$. *Let* $n \geq 1$. *Assume that* $\mathrm{Sym}^n(\pi(\varphi))$ *is a cuspidal representation of* $\mathrm{GL}_{n+1}(\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{Q}})$. *Let*

$$\Pi = \mathrm{Sym}^n(\pi(\varphi)) \otimes \xi \otimes \| \ \|^s$$

where ξ *is any idèle class character such that* $\xi_\infty = \mathrm{sgn}^\epsilon$, *with* $\epsilon \in \{0,1\}$, *and* $\| \ \|$ *is the adèlic norm. We suppose that* s *and* ϵ *satisfy:*

1. *If* n *is even, then let* $s \in \mathbb{Z}$ *and* $\epsilon \equiv n(k-1)/2 \pmod 2$.
2. *If* n *is odd then, we let* $s \in \mathbb{Z}$ *if* k *is even, and we let* $s \in 1/2 + \mathbb{Z}$ *if* k *is odd. We impose no condition on* ϵ.

Then $\Pi \in \mathrm{Coh}(G_{n+1}, \mu^\vee)$ *where* $\mu \in X^+(T_{n+1})$ *is given by*

$$\mu = \left(\frac{n(k-2)}{2} + s, \frac{(n-2)(k-2)}{2} + s, \dots, \frac{-n(k-2)}{2} + s \right) = (k-2)\rho_{n+1} + s.$$

Here ρ_{n+1} *is half the sum of positive roots of* GL_{n+1}. *In other words, the representation* $\mathrm{Sym}^n(\pi(\varphi)) \otimes \xi \otimes | \cdot |^s$, *with* ξ *and* s *as above, contributes to cuspidal cohomology of the locally symmetric space* $\mathrm{GL}_{n+1}(\mathbb{Q}) \backslash \mathrm{GL}_{n+1}(\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{Q}})/K_f K^\circ_{n+1,\infty}$ *with coefficients in the local system determined by* $\rho_{\mu^\vee}$, *where* K_f *is a deep enough open compact subgroup of* $\mathrm{GL}_{n+1}(\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{Q},f})$. *(Here* $\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{Q},f}$ *denotes the finite adèles of* $\mathbb{Q}$.*)*

Proof. See [29, Theorem 5.5]. □

Corollary 4.2.2. *Let* $\varphi \in S_k(N, \omega)$. *Assume that* $k \geq 2$ *and that* φ *is not dihedral. Then, up to twisiting by a quadratic character,* $\mathrm{Sym}^n(\pi(\varphi))$ *for* $n = 2, 3, 4$, *contributes to cuspidal cohomology.*

4.3. **Special values.** As in the hypothesis of the above corollary, consider a holomorphic primitive modular form $\varphi \in S_k(N, \omega)$. Assume that $k \geq 2$ and that φ is not dihedral (the other cases being done with, as far as special values are concerned). Let $\Pi = \mathrm{Sym}^4(\pi(\varphi))$. Then by Theorem 4.2.1 we have $\Pi \in \mathrm{Coh}(\mathrm{GL}_5, \mu^\vee)$ where $\mu = (k-2)\rho_5$. We may appeal to Mahnkopf [24] and get information on the special values of $L(s, \Pi)$ and hence about $L(s, \mathrm{Sym}^4\varphi)$. The purpose of this section is to record, what according to us, are some impediments of this strategy.

1. *Nonvanishing hypothesis.* Mahnkopf's work [24] is based on a certain nonvanishing hypothesis. This hypothesis shows up in several other works on special values of L-functions which are based on cohomological interpretations of zeta integrals. See [29, §6.2] for a summary of the main results of [24] and this nonvanishing hypothesis. Eliminating this hypothesis, a problem which concerns archimedean zeta integrals, is an important technical problem.
2. *Auxiliary twisting.* In [24] there is an auxiliary character η which has been brought in to finesse the bad places for the representations at hand. The presence of this character only gives the special values of certain twisted L-functions, and not any particular L-function that one might care about. We believe that it is possible to work through Mahnkopf [24], while using the observation that special values of local L-functions are always rational. (See [7, Lemme 4.6].) This is work in progress, and we hope to report on this on a future ocassion.
3. *Explicit comparison of periods.* This is a far more philosophical problem. The periods of Harder and Mahnkopf (and more generally those in §2) come by comparing rational structures on the Whittaker model and on a certain cohomology space. However, in Deligne's conjectures, the periods come by comparing rational structures on the de Rham and Betti realization of the underlying motive. There is no obvious comparison between these periods. Untill this problem is explicitly solved, the best one can hope is to prove a theorem which only formally looks like the predictions made by Deligne [8].

References

[1] L. Barthel and D. Ramakrishnan, *A nonvanishing result for twists of L-functions of* $\mathrm{GL}(n)$. Duke Math. J., 74, no. 3, 681–700 (1994).

[2] D. Bertrand, *Endomorphismes de groupes algébriques; applications arithmétiques. (French) [Endomorphisms of algebraic groups; arithmetic applications]* Diophantine approximations and transcendental numbers (Luminy, 1982), 1–45, Progr. Math., 31, Birkhuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1983.

[3] D. Blasius, *Period relations and critical values of L-functions.* Olga Taussky-Todd: in memoriam. Pacific J. Math., Special Issue, 53–83 (1997).

[4] A. Borel, *Regularization theorems in Lie algebra cohomology. Applications.* Duke Math.J., 50, 605–623, (1983).

[5] A. Borel and H. Jacquet, *Automorphic forms and automorphic representations.* Proc.Sympos. Pure Math., XXXIII, Automorphic forms, representations and L-functions (Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., Oregon State Univ., Corvallis, Ore., 1977), Part 1, pp. 189–207, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R.I., 1979.

[6] A. Borel and N. Wallach, *Continuous cohomology, discrete subgroups, and representations of reductive groups.* Second edition. Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, 67. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2000.

[7] L. Clozel, *Motifs et formes automorphes: applications du principe de fonctorialité.(French) [Motives and automorphic forms: applications of the functoriality principle]* Automorphic

forms, Shimura varieties, and L-functions, Vol. I (Ann Arbor, MI, 1988), 77–159, Perspect. Math., 10, Academic Press, Boston, MA, 1990.

[8] P. Deligne, *Valeurs de fonctions L et périodes d'intégrales (French),* With an appendix by N. Koblitz and A. Ogus. Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., XXXIII, Automorphic forms, representations and L-functions (Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., Oregon State Univ., Corvallis, Ore., 1977), Part 2, pp. 313–346, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R.I., 1979.

[9] P. Garrett and M. Harris, *Special values of triple product L-functions.* American J. Math., Vol 115, 159–238 (1993).

[10] S. Gelbart, *Automorphic forms on adèle groups.* Annals of Mathematics Studies, No. 83. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J.; University of Tokyo Press, Tokyo, (1975).

[11] S. Gelbart and H. Jacquet, *A relation between automorphic representations of* $\mathrm{GL}(2)$ *and* $\mathrm{GL}(3)$. Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) 11, no. 4, 471–542 (1978).

[12] G. Harder, *General aspects in the theory of modular symbols.* Seminar on number theory, Paris 1981–82 (Paris, 1981/1982), 73–88, Progr. Math., 38, Birkhuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1983.

[13] M. Harris, *Occult period invariants and critical values of the degree four L-function of* $\mathrm{GSp}(4)$. Contributions to automorphic forms, geometry, and number theory, 331–354, Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, Baltimore, MD, 2004.

[14] H. Kim, *Functoriality for the exterior square of* GL_4 *and the symmetric fourth of* GL_2. With appendix 1 by Dinakar Ramakrishnan and appendix 2 by Kim and Peter Sarnak. J. Amer. Math. Soc. 16 (2003), no. 1, 139–183 (electronic).

[15] H. Kim and F. Shahidi, *Holomorphy of Rankin triple L-functions; special values and root numbers for symmetric cube L-functions.* Israel Jour. of Math., 120, 449–466 (2000).

[16] H. Kim and F. Shahidi, *Functorial products for* $\mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_3$ *and the symmetric cube for* GL_2. *With an appendix by Colin J. Bushnell and Guy Henniart.* Ann. of Math. (2) 155, no. 3, 837–893 (2002).

[17] H. Kim and F. Shahidi, *Cuspidality of symmetric powers with applications.* Duke Math. J. 112, no. 1, 177–197 (2002).

[18] A. Knapp, *Local Langlands correspondence: the Archimedean case,* Proc. Symp. Pure Math., vol 55, part II, 393–410, (1994).

[19] A. Knapp and E. Stein, *Intertwining operators for semisimple groups. II.* Invent. Math. 60, no. 1, 9–84 (1980).

[20] S. Kudla, *The local Langlands correspondence : The non-Archimedean case,* Proc. Symp. Pure Math., vol 55, part II, 365-391 (1994).

[21] J.-P. Labesse and R.P. Langlands, *L-indistinguishability for* $\mathrm{SL}(2)$*,* Canad.J.Math., vol 31, no.4, 726–785 (1979).

[22] J.-P. Labesse and J. Schwermer, *On liftings and cusp cohomology of arithmetic groups.* Invent. Math., 83, 383–401 (1986).

[23] J. Mahnkopf, *On the special values of automorphic L-functions,* C.R.Acad.Sci.Paris, Ser.I 338, 759–762 (2004).

[24] J. Mahnkopf, *Cohomology of arithmetic groups, parabolic subgroups and the special values of L-functions of* GL_n*,* J.Inst.Math.Jussieu., 4(4), 553-637 (2005).

[25] T. Miyake, *Modular forms.* Translated from the Japanese by Yoshitaka Maeda. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1989.

[26] V.K. Murty and D. Ramakrishnan, *Period relations and the Tate conjecture for Hilbert modular surfaces.* Invent. Math. 89, no. 2, 319–345 (1987).

[27] J. Neukirch, *Algebraic number theory.* Translated from the 1992 German original and with a note by Norbert Schappacher. With a foreword by G. Harder. Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], 322. Springer-Verlag, Berlin. xviii+571 pp (1999).

[28] A.A. Panchishkin, *Motives over totally real fields and p-adic L-functions.* Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) 44, no. 4, 989–1023 (1994).

[29] A. Raghuram and F. Shahidi, *Functoriality and special values of L-functions,* To appear in the proceedings of the AIMS workshop on Eisensetein series and Applications, (2005).

[30] D. Ramakrishnan, *Modularity of the Rankin-Selberg L-series, and multiplicity one for* SL(2). Ann. of Math., (2) 152, no. 1, 45–111 (2000).

[31] D. Rohrlich, *Nonvanishing of L-functions for $GL(2)$*, Invent. Math., 97, 381-403(1989).

[32] A.J. Scholl, *Motives for modular forms.* Invent. Math. 100, no. 2, 419–430 (1990).

[33] F. Shahidi, *Symmetric power L-functions for* GL(2). Elliptic curves and related topics, 159–182, CRM Proc. Lecture Notes, 4, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1994.

[34] G. Shimura, *The special values of the zeta functions associated with cusp forms,* Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 29, no. 6, 783–804, (1976).

[35] G. Shimura, *On the periods of modular forms,* Math. Ann., 229, no. 3, 211–221, (1977).

[36] J. Sturm, *Special values of zeta functions, and Eisenstein series of half integral weight,* Amer. J. Math., 102, no. 2, 219–240, (1980).

[37] J. Sturm, *Evaluation of the symmetric square at the near center point,* Amer. J. Math., 111, no. 4, 585–598, (1989).

[38] J. Tate, *Fourier analysis in number fields and Hecke's zeta function,* Algebraic Number Theory (Proc. Instructional Conf., Brighton, 1965) pp. 305–347 Thompson, Washington, D.C. (1967).

[39] J.-L. Waldspurger, *Quelques proprie'te's arithme'tiques de certaines formes automorphes sur* GL(2). *(French) [Some arithmetical properties of certain automorphic forms on* GL(2)*]* Compositio Math., 54, no. 2, 121–171, (1985).

[40] D. Zagier, *Modular forms whose Fourier coefficients involve zeta functions of quadratic fields.* Modular forms of one variable VI, Springer Verlag LNM 627, 105–169 (1977).

Address:

A. Raghuram, Department of Mathematics, Oklahoma State University, 401 Mathematical Sciences, Stillwater, OK 74078, USA. E-mail : `araghur@math.okstate.edu`

Freydoon Shahidi, Department of Mathematics, Purdue University, 150 N. University Street, West Lafayette, IN 47907, USA. E-mail : `shahidi@math.purdue.edu`